

The Byzantine Afterlife of Procopius's *Buildings*

MAX RITTER

The historian Procopius of Caesarea (fl. 540–555) had a significant impact on subsequent Byzantine historians and chroniclers. This becomes apparent when looking at the impressive although incomplete catalogue that Berthold Rubin compiled in 1957 highlighting the enormous influence of his *Wars* on Byzantine historiography.¹ The same, however, cannot be said of the panegyrist's *De aedificiis* (*Aed.*), the *Buildings*.² To date, the reception, or aftermath, of the *Buildings* has not been discussed in a comprehensive study, and an analysis of intertextual links to later Byzantine texts remains a desideratum.³ The

formidable task of reconstructing the afterlife of the *Buildings* in Byzantium has not yet been undertaken, and remains so, as the purpose here is merely to evaluate the start, focus, and range of the *Buildings*' reception by exploring its intertextual relationship with later works, not to compile a complete list of *testimonia*.

It is worthwhile investigating the reception of the *Buildings* anew because it can shed light on the perception Byzantine authors had of the text, such as why it failed to become part of the Byzantine corpus of "classical" literature, and how the text was utilized to construct an image of the Justinianic past.⁴ In contrast to Günter Prinzing's seminal study of the image of Emperor Justinian I in post-Justinianic Byzantium, which examined the gamut of accomplishments of his reign,⁵ this investigation focuses solely on the literary

1 B. Rubin, "Prokopios von Kaisareia," *RE* 23 (Stuttgart, 1957), 273–599, at 311 (though some caution is warranted due to its being outdated and incomplete); M. Whitby, "Greek Historical Writing after Procopius: Variety and Vitality," in *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East*, vol. 1, *Problems in the Literary Source Material*, ed. A. M. Cameron and L. I. Conrad (Princeton, 1992), 25–80, at 25. Marek Jankowiak kindly made available to me his paper on the continuators of Procopius's *Wars*, to be published in *Brill's Companion to Procopius of Caesarea*, ed. M. Meier and F. Montinaro (Leiden, forthcoming).

2 The standard edition of the text remains J. Haury, ed., *Procopii Caesariensis Opera Omnia*, rev. G. Wirth, vol. 4 (Leipzig, 1964). The useful commentaries to date are P. Ł. Grotowski, *Prokopiusz z Cezarei, O budowlach (Peri ktismaton)* (Warsaw, 2006); D. Roques, *Procopée de Césarée, Constructions de Justinien Ier (Περὶ κτισμάτων/De aedificiis)*, *Hellenica* 39 (Alessandria, 2011); C. Dell'Osso, *Procopio di Cesarea, Gli edifici*, *Studi di antichità cristiana* 67 (Vatican City, 2018).

3 On the manuscript's transmission, see J. Haury, "Über Prokophandschriften," *SBMünch* (1895): 125–76, at 173–76, and Haury, *Procopii Caesariensis Opera Omnia* 4, v–viii. Two subsequently

discovered manuscripts and some fragments led to the updated survey by B. Flusin, "Remarques sur la tradition manuscrite du *De aedificiis*," *AntTard* 8 (2000): 9–17. Dell'Osso, *Gli edifici*, 53, devotes a few lines to the topic.

4 P. Magdalino, "The Distance of the Past in Early Medieval Byzantium (VII–X Centuries)," *Settimane* 46 (1999): 115–46. Malalas, not Procopius, was to become the most influential writer in reconstructing the Justinianic past: R. D. Scott, "Writing the Reign of Justinian: Malalas versus Theophanes," in *The Sixth Century: End or Beginning?*, ed. P. Allen and E. M. Jeffreys (Brisbane, 1996), 20–34, esp. 28–34.

5 G. Prinzing, "Das Bild Justinians I. in der späteren Überlieferung der Byzantiner vom 7. bis 15. Jahrhundert," *FM* 7 (1986): 1–99. Here the emperor's building activity ranks as the third most consequential element driving perceptions of his reign, the first two being

legacy of Justinian's building activity. The text of the *Buildings* as we have it is entirely due to its transmission during the Byzantine era. Examining the reception of the text—transmitted in two recensions whose relationship to one another remains highly controversial—offers the possibility of acquiring new insight into the nature of the work.

The *Buildings* is the last of Procopius's three works, written in praise of Emperor Justinian I (r. 527–565) and extolling his building activities in six books. The primary novelty of the text in terms of its genre is its framework as an imperial panegyric, although the author designates it a history in the exordium, while the main text consists of a sequence of ekphraseis, for the most part on edifices.⁶ Thus, it is a hybrid of sorts.⁷ Procopius organized the *Buildings* geographically, modeled loosely after Strabo's *Geographica* and Arrian's *Periplus*.⁸ He began with Constantinople in book 1, which was followed by the eastern frontier in books 2 and 3, the

Balkans in book 4, the other provinces of Asia in book 5, and finally the African territories of the empire in book 6. Dalmatia, Italy, and Sicily are not covered.

The manuscripts, some of them Byzantine and others post-Byzantine, distinctly transmit two recensions of the *Buildings*, the main difference between them being their length. The “long” recension—here indicated by an asterisk (*)—is about 35 percent longer than the “short” recension.⁹ It contains many more sites, especially in book 4,¹⁰ and is also more polished in its rhetoric, most notably in book 1. Thus far, only the long recension has been critically edited—Beatus Rhenanus printed the short version in 1531¹¹—so most scholars are comfortable using the long recension as a historical source.¹² Half of the current scholarship assigns the long recension a date of 554 or 555, primarily because the collapse of Hagia Sophia's dome in 558 goes

his expansive foreign policy and the codification of Roman law. Prinzing's study entirely supersedes J. Irmscher, “Justinianbild und Justiniankritik im frühen Byzanz,” in *Studien zum 7. Jahrhundert in Byzanz: Probleme der Herausbildung des Feudalismus*, ed. H. Köpstein and F. Winkelmann, BBA 47 (Berlin, 1976), 131–42, and follows H. Hunger, “Kaiser Justinian I. (527–565),” *Anzeiger der philosophisch-historischen Klasse* (Munich) 14 (1965): 339–56. R. D. Scott, “Narrating Justinian: From Malalas to Manasses,” in *Byzantine Narrative: Papers in Honour of Roger Scott*, ed. J. Burke (Melbourne, 2006), 29–46, outlines the emperor's image in the chrorical tradition. I was unable to consult the Finnish study by V. Tajakka, *Justinianuksen keisariuden kuva bysanttilaisissa histori-ankirjoissa ja kronikoissa* (Ortokirja, 1982).

6 M. Whitby, “Procopius' *Buildings*, Book I: A Panegyric Perspective,” *AntTard* 8 (2000): 45–57. J. Elsner, “The Rhetoric of Buildings in the *De Aedificiis* of Procopius,” in *Art and Text in Byzantine Culture*, ed. L. James (Cambridge, 2007), 33–57, argues that the *Buildings* should be read as a lengthy ekphrasis, not as a historical description of actual buildings. Most recently, J. Signes Codoñer, “One History . . . in Several Instalments: Dating and Genre in Procopius' Works,” *RSBN* 54 (2017): 3–26, at 20–23, maintains adhering to Procopius's designation of the work as history, which is only asserted in the exordium and can be read as Procopius's retrospective sentiments about the *Wars*.

7 In the words of M. Mullett, “The Madness of Genre,” *DOP* 46 (1992): 233–43, at 237, “An encomium in the form of a series of ecphraseis with a historical prooimium.”

8 M. Maas, “Strabo and Procopius: Classical Geography for a Christian Empire,” in *From Rome to Constantinople: Studies in Honour of Averil Cameron*, ed. H. Amirav and B. Ter Haar Romeny (Leuven, 2007), 67–83; T. Pekkanen, “Procopius and the Periplus of Arrian,” *Eranos* 62 (1964): 40–51.

9 F. Montinaro, “Byzantium and the Slavs in the Reign of Justinian: Comparing the Two Recensions of Procopius's *Buildings*,” in *The Pontic-Danubian Realm in the Period of the Great Migration*, ed. V. Ivanišević and M. Kazanski (Paris, 2011), 89–114, at 93.

10 Montinaro, “Byzantium and the Slavs,” 92–95.

11 For a modern edition, see F. Montinaro, “Études sur l'évergétisme imperial à Byzance” (PhD diss., École Pratique des Hautes Études-Sorbonne, 2013), superseding Beatus Rhenanus's edition in the appendix of *Procopii Caesariensis de rebus Gothorum, Persarum ac Vandalorum libri VII, una cum aliis mediorum temporum historicis* (Basel, 1531). Montinaro kindly made his forthcoming version for publication available to me.

12 Scholars have held strongly opposing points of view on the relationship between the two recensions. Haury, “Prokophandschriften,” 173, considers the short recension no more than an abridgement of the long text. This view was also adopted by M. Whitby, “Justinian's Bridge over the Sangarius and the Date of Procopius' *de Aedificiis*,” *JHS* 105 (1985): 129–48, at 143, n. 66. Flusin, “Remarques sur la tradition manuscrite du *De aedificiis*,” 12–14, reinforces this assessment, without offering any logic in the abridgement, as he himself concedes (p. 13). On the other hand, Montinaro argues that the short recension is the earlier of the texts, prepared up until 550, and considers the longer text to be a reworking that Procopius completed by the end of 554: F. Montinaro, “Power, Taste and the Outsider: Procopius and the *Buildings* Revisited,” in *Shifting Genres in Late Antiquity*, ed. G. Greatrex and H. Elton (Aldershot, 2015), 191–206, at 206. This idea was first tentatively suggested by Rubin, “Prokopios,” 299, and G. Downey, “The Composition of Procopius, *De aedificiis*,” *TAPA* 78 (1947): 171–83, at 176–81, who calls the short recension the “original draft.” Juan Signes Codoñer, “One History,” 4 and 24, supports Federico Montinaro's view. Georgios Makris thinks the long version is a fabrication from the Macedonian period based on the short recension. Makris presented his ideas on the matter at a workshop at Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz in January 2016.

unmentioned,¹³ yet as many scholars prefer a later date, circa 560 to 562, mostly because of the inclusion of the Sangaris bridge, thought to have been under construction until 562.¹⁴

The exact date of the text, however, is irrelevant to the *Buildings*' reception. In terms of textual criticism, special interest in the two recensions stems from both texts being circulated and used by Byzantine authors. The earliest witness, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (Vat.), gr. 1065, was written in the twelfth century,¹⁵ and most if not all of the eleven pre-1453 manuscripts—six of the short version and five of the long version¹⁶—can be traced back to

13 E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire* (Paris, 1949), 2:722 and 837; A. M. Cameron, *Procopius and the Sixth Century* (Berkeley, 1985), 9–10 and 84–85; G. Greatrex, "The Dates of Procopius' Works," *BMGS* 18 (1994): 101–14, esp. 105–6; G. Greatrex, "Recent Work on Procopius and the Composition of *Wars* VIII," *BMGS* 27 (2003): 45–67, at 50; J. D. Howard-Johnston, "The Education and Expertise of Procopius," *AntTard* 8 (2000): 19–30, at 21–22; A. Kaldellis, *Procopius of Caesarea: Tyranny, History, and Philosophy at the End of Antiquity* (Philadelphia, 2004), 46.

14 J. Haury, *Procopiana I: Programm des Königlichen Realgymnasiums Augsburg* (Augsburg, 1890/91), 3–37, at 27–30, conceding book 1 an earlier date than the other books; Rubin, "Prokopios," 311; E. M. Jeffreys, "Malalas, Procopius and Justinian's Buildings," *AntTard* 8 (2000): 73–79; Downey, "Composition of Procopius," 181; J. A. S. Evans, "The Dates of Procopius' Works: A Recapitulation of the Evidence," *GRBS* 37 (1996): 301–13, at 303–5; Whitby, "Bridge over the Sangarius," 141–42; M. Whitby, "Pride and Prejudice in Procopius' Buildings: Imperial Images in Constantinople," *AntTard* 8 (2000): 59–66; F. De' Maffei, *Edifici di Giustiniano nell'ambito dell'impero*, Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo 10 (Spoleto, 1988), 90; A. D. Karpouzilos, *Βυζαντινοί ιστορικοί και χρονολογιστές* (Athens, 1997), 1:378; Roques, *Procope de Césarée, Constructions* 52–59; J. Signes Codoñer, "Prokops Anecdota und Justinians Nachfolge," *JÖB* 53 (2003): 47–82, at 54 and 80; E. Kislinger, "Ein Angriff zu viel: Zur Verteidigung der Thermopylen in justinianischer Zeit," *BZ* 91 (1998): 49–58, at 55, nn. 56–58.

15 A. Pertusi, *Costantino Porfirogenito, De thematibus*, ST 160 (Vatican City, 1952), 4–6; Flusin, "Remarques sur la tradition manuscrite du *De aedificiis*," 11. Some scholars, however, might have been led to predate the manuscript by P. Canart, "Le livre grec en Italie méridionale sous les règnes normand et souabe: Aspects matériels et sociaux," *Scrittura e civiltà* 2 (1978): 103–62, at 149, n. 133, where an unfortunate typo was produced in a comment referring to Vat. gr. 1065, rather than the manuscript discussed here. For example, B. Mondrain, "Le *De thematibus* de Constantin Porphyrogénète dans les manuscrits," *TM* 23.1 (2019): 613–24, at 616, dates it to the end of the eleventh century.

16 Flusin, "Remarques sur la tradition manuscrite du *De aedificiis*," 10–12, provides the most comprehensive list. Montinaro, *Études sur l'évergétisme*, ix–xx, makes a few modifications.

Constantinople.¹⁷ Of note, most transmissions of *Wars* are separate from *Buildings* and the *Anecdota* (*Secret History*);¹⁸ only five of the eighty-four Procopian codices contain more than one of Procopius's works.¹⁹

The Byzantine reception of late antique texts is only discernible by analyzing textual relations between them and later texts. Byzantine authors and readers used various modalities of engagement principally distinguishable through structuralist literary theory:²⁰ metatextuality—literary criticism of a text;²¹ paratextuality—glosses and scholia to a text; and intertextuality—citations of and allusions to a text. The latter, intertextuality, the main concern of this study, lacks an operational definition and has emerged as a catchall term,²² referring both to links to an earlier text crafted by the author and unintentional connections to a subtext. Citations and allusions constitute its main tools.

Most Byzantine authors did not reveal their influences and sources, so in their works, citations are less frequent than allusions, which by nature tend to be more elusive.²³ An allusion could be an indirect or implicit

17 B. Croke, "Procopius: From Manuscripts to Books, 1400–1850," *Histos* 9 (2019): 1–173, at 12. Croke's seminal study is now the most important for the later life of the text. For earlier remarks, see M. K. Kalli, *The Manuscript Tradition of Procopius' Gothic Wars: A Reconstruction of Family in the Light of a Hitherto Unknown Manuscript (Athos, Lavra H-73)* (Munich, 2004), 166. For the Latin translations of the sixteenth century, see R. Forrai, "Procopius Caesariensis," in *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum: Medieval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries*, ed. G. Dinkova-Bruun (Toronto, 2016), 11:211–36.

18 Haury, "Über Prokophandschriften," 126.

19 Croke, "From Manuscripts to Books," 138–39.

20 G. Genette, *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré* (Paris, 1982); idem, *Seuils* (Paris, 1987). Genette's typology has been recently put to good use for analysis of the tenth-century text by I. Nilson, "The Same Story, but Another: A Reappraisal of Literary Imitation in Byzantium," in *Imitatio–Aemulatio–Variatio*, ed. A. Rhoby and E. Schiffer (Vienna, 2010), 195–208, at 202–6.

21 For Byzantine literary criticism, see the overview by T. M. Conley, "Byzantine Criticism and the Uses of Literature," in *Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. 2, *The Middle Ages*, ed. A. J. Minnis, P. Brooks, and H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge, 2005), 669–92.

22 On the problem of defining the term, see W. Irwin, "Against Intertextuality," *Philosophy and Literature* 28 (2004): 227–42, where intertextuality includes relationships between texts regardless of whether a connection was intended by the author.

23 See the definition of "Markierte Intertextualität" offered by J. Helbig, *Intertextualität und Markierung: Untersuchungen zur Systematik und Funktion der Signalisierung von Intertextualität* (Heidelberg, 1996), 111–20.

reference that required the audience, for example, in the *theatron*, to make associations beyond the mere substitution of a referent, directing them to an external text that typically was not readily known to everyone.²⁴ Generally speaking, an allusion must in principle be recognizable to serve as a means of communication and can be employed for several purposes: to deliver instruction to an audience because they are susceptible to persuasion; to engage the audience in a creative process of understanding, which brings the pleasure of recognition; and to link the author or orator with a tradition through activating themes, motifs, and symbols.²⁵

This latter aspect of allusions deserves closer scrutiny because it is widely recognized as the primary device used by Byzantine authors. For their purposes, an allusion invited the reader to interpret the source text in light of the intertext. This process of understanding involved intensifying, undermining, or recasting the original.²⁶ Byzantine authors usually echoed earlier texts without explicitly identifying them, instead preferring to highlight such references (e.g., citing poetry in a prose text) to alert audiences to the allusion. This opened a second level of literary interpretation that gave the author's work more depth by providing it an additional contextual layer and amplifying certain of its aspects. In classical and Byzantine literature generally, this was the prevalent mode of authorial engagement, commonly referred to as mimesis, that is, imitation of an ancient literary model.²⁷ Allusion, however, should not be interpreted based on the binary concept of

imitation and influence, but as a discourse strategy that creates an interrelationship between texts.²⁸

Allusions can be hard to detect and to grasp. Since subtext can be lost, modes of influence can be difficult to discern. A valid allusion is thought to require some similarity or opposition of ideas in the respective texts. In late antique and Byzantine contexts, it usually involved at least two identical or closely related words.²⁹ Sometimes an accumulation of evidence is presented: identifying an allusion is easier if the author making it is known from other instances to have read the text to which he is thought to be alluding. That said, the line between allusions and vague parallels is sometimes thin,³⁰ for example, in the case of Procopius rendering it impossible to determine whether an author is alluding to the *Buildings* or to a text to which Procopius himself had previously alluded. Thus, to believe that a passage contains a genuine allusion remains to some degree a matter of judgment. It is not only due to this conceivable scenario that the quest to find traces of the *Buildings* in later works is a precarious operation and of questionable validity, but also because it is equally possible that in many cases Byzantine authors took the passages not directly from it but from now-lost intermediaries—for example, hypothesized Procopian excerpts or florilegia, whose existence might be doubted because none are extant—combining or intermingling several authors. Those cases where the later text is not that close to the *Buildings*, but is better described as loosely alluding to the same literary model, might more likely point to common origins in the literary tradition than to direct reference to the *Buildings*.

Intertextuality with the *Buildings*

Unlike the *Wars*, Procopius's *Buildings* had a narrow, almost undetectable impact on subsequent Byzantine literature. There is simply no evidence of the use or knowledge of the *Buildings* between the sixth and tenth centuries. However, *ex silentio*, one cannot preclude that the text was accessible or known before the tenth

24 W. Irwin, "What Is an Allusion?," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 59 (2001): 287–97, at 293–94. A similar definition is offered by Helbig, *Intertextualität*, 87–94.

25 W. Irwin, "The Aesthetics of Allusion," *Journal of Value Inquiry* 36 (2002): 521–32, at 521–23.

26 D. Rohrbacher, *The Play of Allusion in the Historia Augusta* (Madison, WI, 2016), 16.

27 The standard study on this subject remains H. Hunger, "On the Imitation (μίμησις) of Antiquity in Byzantine Literature," *DOP* 23/24 (1969/70): 15–38. A more refined definition of mimesis in mid-Byzantine literature is provided by S. Papaioannou, *Michael Psellos: Rhetoric and Authorship in Byzantium* (Cambridge, 2013), esp. 124–27; W. Hörandner, "Literary Criticism in 11th-Century Byzantium: Views of Michael Psellos on John Chrysostom's Style," *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 2 (1996): 336–44, at 337. For a twelfth-century example of mimesis, see P. A. Agapitos, "Mischung der Gattungen und Überschreitung der Gesetze: Die Grabrede des Eustathios von Thessalonike auf Nikolaos Hagiotheodorites," *JÖB* 48 (1998): 119–46.

28 A useful introduction to the concepts involved in intertextuality can be found in M. Worton and J. Still, eds., *Intertextuality: Theories and Practice* (Manchester, 1990).

29 See G. Kelly, *Ammianus Marcellinus: The Allusive Historian* (Cambridge, 2008), 166.

30 Helbig, *Intertextualität*, 45–46.

century. In a nutshell, neither Agathias, John of Nikiou, or Evagrius echo the *Buildings*, although they made extensive use of the *Wars*.³¹ Paul the Silentiary also did not refer to it. Theophanes inserted long excerpts from the *Wars* in his chronicle (completed during 814/815) but is apparently unaware of the *Buildings*.³² The authors (or author) of the *Parastaseis syntomai chronikai*, writing sometime between 710 and 780,³³ could have benefited from book 1 of the *Buildings* in commenting on the ubiquitous Justinianic constructions in Constantinople, as they were in a position to see and know them firsthand. Ignorance of the the *Buildings*

carried on in the *Narratio de aedificatione Sanctae Sophiae*, written most likely in the 880s and supposedly recording the building history of Hagia Sophia.³⁴

Macedonian Era

At the turn of the ninth century, the Byzantine cultural milieu stood on the brink of a transformation that appears under the rubric “Macedonian Renaissance,” an age characterized by efforts to collect and systematize antique and late antique texts.³⁵ A possible first allusion to the *Buildings* concerns the thirty-seventh homily of Emperor Leo VI from the 890s on the new church of his friend and father-in-law Stylianus Zautzes. It is reminiscent of Procopius’s description of Hagia Sophia:

Κίονες τέτταρες ἄνθει καλλωπιζόμενοι, ὁ χειμῶνος ἄρτι λυθέντος, οὐ μόνον πρὸς ὥραϊσμόν ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς χρεῖαν τῶν οἰκητῶρων ἀναγκαίαν προβάλλεται γῆ—τὸ χλοάζον χρῶμα συνήσι πάντως ὁ ἀκροατής—, τὰς ἀψίδας φέρουσιν αἰωρουμένας. συμμιγῆ καὶ ποικίλῃ χρῶα τὸ ἔδαφος περιήνθισται. οὐ μὲν γὰρ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τὸ λευκὸν διατρέχει, οὐδὲ συμμίκτων ἐτέρων χρωμάτων συνθέσει εἰς ψηφίδας πολυχρώμου διεσχηματισμένης λίθου, ἢ λευκότης περιτειχίζεται· καὶ ταῦτα πάλιν οἶά τισι βρύμασι πλαξὶ πορφυρίζουσας περιστοιχίζεται, κάκεῖνα σύνθεσις μιμουμένη γῆς ἄνθη ποικίλα περιλαμβάνει. ἐμοὶ

31 P. Allen, *Evagrius Scholasticus the Church Historian* (Leuven, 1981), 9–10 and 186. Two passages in Evagrius on Justinian’s building of Hagia Sophia (4.31) and the reconstruction of 150 cities in Libya (4.18) might suggest familiarity with the *Buildings*, but the parallels are too distant to prove his reading of it. See M. Whitby, trans., *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*, TTH 33 (Liverpool, 2000), xxix, n. 48, and 218, n. 48; and Allen, *Evagrius Scholasticus*, 186. Their evaluation follows A. E. Kaldellis, “Identifying Dissident Circles in Sixth-Century Byzantium: The Friendship of Prokopios and Ioannes Lydos,” *Florilegium* 21 (2004): 1–17, at 2.

32 Prinzing, “Bild Justinians,” 70–71. Theophanes’ use of the *Persian* and *Vandal Wars* is analyzed in C. A. Mango and R. D. Scott, eds., *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History, AD 284–813* (Oxford, 1997), xci–xciv. Seemingly, his codex did not contain *Wars*, books 5 to 8, as a considerable number of witnesses of the text divide it halfway. Of note, Theophanes’ contemporary Patriarch Nicephorus I is apparently also ignorant of the *Buildings*, as is demonstrated by his praise of Justinian’s wars and the erection of Hagia Sophia in his third *Antirrheticus*: *Antirrhetici adversus Iconomachos* 3.81 (PG 100:524). The text is dated to 818–20 by P. J. Alexander, *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople: Ecclesiastical Policy and Image Worship in the Byzantine Empire* (Oxford, 1958), 170–73.

33 A. M. Cameron and J. Herrin, eds., *Constantinople in the Early Eighth Century: The Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai*, Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 10 (Leiden, 1984), 23–29 and 53, argue for a date around 710 due to some positive remarks on Emperor Philippicus, yet they concede limited later additions. I. Ševčenko, “The Search for the Past in Byzantium around the Year 800,” *DOP* 46 (1992): 279–93, at 289, n. 31, contests this view and opts for a date around 775 and discusses suggestions in previous scholarship as well as the level of knowledge of the authors. O. Kresten, “Leon III. und die Landmauern von Konstantinopel: Zur Datierung von c. 3 der *Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai*,” *RHM* 36 (1994): 21–52, came to the same conclusion concerning the date. B. Anderson, “Classified Knowledge: The Epistemology of Statuary in the *Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai*,” *BMGS* 35 (2011): 1–19, at 5, persuasively argues against a clear-cut date of this heterogeneous dossier that might have been collected with the intention to write a chronicle, as argued by P. Odorico, “Du recueil à l’invention du texte: Le cas des *Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai*,” *BZ* 107 (2014): 755–83.

34 The date was established by S. Efthymiadis, “Diegesis on Hagia Sophia from Late Antiquity to Tenth-Century Byzantium,” *BSL* 73 (2015): 7–22, at 15–18, who persuasively refines the proposal of G. Dagron, *Constantinople imaginaire: Études sur le recueil des ‘Patria,’ Bibliothèque byzantine, études* 8 (Paris, 1984), 265–69 (suggesting a date from Theophilus to Leo VI), and C. A. Mango, “Byzantine Writers on the Fabric of Hagia Sophia,” in *Hagia Sophia from the Age of Justinian to the Present*, ed. R. Mark and A. S. Çakmak (Cambridge, 1992), 41–56, at 45–50, who had already dated it more narrowly to the reign of Emperor Basil I. One aspect not noted by Efthymiadis but in support of his argument is that the main western arch of Hagia Sophia, threatening collapse after the earthquake of 9 January 869, was duly repaired (*Vita Basilii*, 79), which might be taken as a terminus post quem for the *Narratio* since in its chapter 14 the author disposes of detailed knowledge of the bricks used for the construction of the main arches. Ultimately, it is inconceivable that the *Narratio* was composed in competition with the *Buildings*, 1.1, a text which must have been lapsed into obscurity by that time.

35 Magdalino, “Distance of the Past,” 127–30; W. Treadgold, “The Macedonian Renaissance,” in *Renaissances before the Renaissance: Cultural Revivals of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, ed. W. Treadgold (Stanford, CA, 1984), 75–98.

δοκεῖ, εἴ πως ἦν ἐν τῷ τεμένει συρρεῦσαι μελί-
τας κάναλογῆσαι ταύτας τῶν ἐξ ὧν τὴν γλυκεῖαν
ἐργασίαν ἀνθέων πορίζονται, . . . οὕτως οὐ μόνον
ἡρινῶν ἀνθέων οὐκ ἐνδεῖ ὁμοιότητος, ἀλλ' ἔχει τι
καὶ πλεον εἰς ὠραιότητα. ποίων ἄρα **λειμώνων**
τὰ ἄνθη φυτοκομεῖται ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τούτῳ τῶν
Χαρίτων λειμῶν;³⁶

Four columns adorned with flowers, such as the earth puts forth at the end of winter, not only for beauty but also for the needs of its inhabitants—the beholder perceives it as a grassy green color—support the pendent arches. The ground is covered all over with the hues of various flowers. In places, the surface is traversed by white [patches], in others, the white is framed by a composition of other hues, consisting of multicolored marble cut into tesserae; and this, in turn, is surrounded by purple slabs as if by rivers; the latter, too, are enclosed by a composition imitating the variegated flowers of the earth. If bees happened to come to the church, they would seem to me to take delight in the flowers and to hasten to make honey from the flowers of the pavement. . . . Thus, it is not only similar to the flowers of springtime, but it has even more beauty than those. In sum, to what gardens then belong the flowers cultivated here in this holy garden of the Graces?

Compare with *Aed.* 1.1.59–60:³⁷

Τίς δὲ τῶν τε κίωνων καὶ λίθων διαριθμήσαιο τὴν
εὐπρέπειαν, οἷς τὸ ἱερὸν **κεκαλλώπιστα**; **λειμώνι**
τις ἂν ἐντετυχηκέναι δόξειεν ὠραίῳ τὸ **ἄνθος**.
θαυμάσειε γὰρ εἰκότως, τῶν μὲν τὸ ἀλουργόν,
τῶν δὲ τὸ **χλοάζον**, καὶ οἷς τὸ φοινικοῦν ἐπανθεῖ
καὶ ὧν τὸ λευκὸν ἀπαστράπτει, ἔτι μέντοι καὶ οὐς

36 Leo VI, Homily 37, 141–68 (T. Antonopoulou, ed., *Leonis Sapientis Imperatoris Byzantini Homiliae*, CCSG 63 [Turnhout, 2008], 476–77).

37 The Greek passages from Procopius's *Buildings* cited in this article are from Hauriy, and the corresponding English translations are from Elodie Turquois, a colleague currently preparing a new translation of the entire work, with some revision for publication here. Unless otherwise noted, all other translations are my own. The bold phrases are the elements of the text relevant for comparison to the *Buildings*.

ταῖς ἐναντιωτάταις ποικίλλει χροιαῖς ὥσπερ τις
ζωγράφος ἢ φύσις.

And who could recount the majesty of the columns and the stones that decorate the sanctuary? One might imagine he had happened upon a meadow in full bloom. For one would naturally marvel at the purple of some, the grassy green of others, at those blooming with Phoenician red and those flashing with white, and still at those that Nature has variegated with contrasting colors, just as a painter would.

Both texts operate within the same *iunctura verborum*, which basically stems from an ekphrasis of spring that was popular in rhetorical exercises deriving from the antique literary tradition.³⁸ Already Lucian of Samosata used the vocabulary of a meadow flowering in spring as an analogy for a wall revetment in his ekphrasis of the *Hall* (*De domo*),³⁹ and it would subsequently become a *locus communis* in ekphrases of buildings. In a roughly similar manner, Paul the Silentiary compared the revetments of Hagia Sophia with vegetation.⁴⁰ Leo's ekphrastic trope, however, is, unlike Procopius' and the other previous authors', contextualized with a description of the church floor;⁴¹ the Thessalian marble is described as being dotted with a pattern resembling grassy green flowers of a meadow. The apparent intertextual relationship between Leo and Procopius thus probably stems from a common literary model that originated in Lucian.

The *Buildings* is also not found in the usual places in many contemporary texts. For example, it is not

38 H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, HAW 12.5 (Munich, 1978), 1:184. One relevant example is the late fifth-century sophist Nicholas of Myra: Nicolai progymnasma 11 (J. Felten, *Nicolai progymnasmata*, Rhetorici greci 11 [Leipzig, 1913], 68). For the same phenomenon in late antique Latin, see M. Roberts, *The Jeweled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity* (Ithaca, NY, 1989), 46–52; M. D. Lauxtermann, *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres: Texts and Contexts*, WByzSt 1 (Vienna, 2003), 61–66.

39 Lucian, *Dom.* 9–11 (M. D. MacLeod, ed., *Luciani opera* [Oxford, 1972], 1:61–62). H. Maguire, *Nectar and Illusion: Nature in Byzantine Art and Literature* (Oxford, 2012), 120–23.

40 Paul the Silentiary, *Ekphrasis*, vv. 286–95 (M. L. Fobelli, ed., *Un tempio per Giustiniano: Santa Sofia di Constantinopoli e la Descrizione di Paulo Silenziario* [Rome, 2005], 52).

41 T. Antonopoulou, *The Homilies of Leo VI*, Medieval Mediterranean 14 (Leiden, 1997), 242–44.

mentioned in the *Bibliotheca* of the patriarch Photius (858–867, 878–886). Photius read the eight books of the *Wars*,⁴² but he mentions no other work of Procopius, most likely because his codex only contained the *Wars*. The *Excerpta Constantiniana* referred to the *Wars* only, and it does so extensively.⁴³

The first text that definitely used the *Buildings* is the so-called *Anonymus Treu*. This sylloge was compiled in the later ninth or tenth century—its sole witness stems from the latter half of the tenth century and made extensive use of the eighth-century *Parastaseis*⁴⁴—and explains the gesture of Justinian's statue on the Augusteum:

Κτίσας ὁ μακάριος Ἰουστινιανὸς τὴν ἁγίαν Σοφίαν ἐκάθηρε τὴν αὐλὴν καὶ ἐμαρμάρωσεν αὐτὴν τὸ πρὶν οὖσαν Γουστειὸν, ὃ ἐρμηνεύται ὀψοπωλεῖον· καὶ ἔστησε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ εἰκόνα ἐπὶ κίονος ἔφιππον· καὶ τῇ μὲν ἀριστερᾷ χειρὶ φέρει σφαῖραν, ἐμπεπηγὸτος σταυροῦ ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ ὑποσημαίνοντος, ὡς διὰ τῆς εἰς τὸν σταυρὸν πίστεως τῆς γῆς ἐγκρατῆς γέγονε· σφαῖρα μὲν γὰρ ἡ γῆ διὰ τὸ σφαιροειδὲς τοῦ αὐτῆς σχήματος· πίστις δὲ ὁ σταυρὸς διὰ τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ σαρκὶ προσηλωθέντα θεόν. τὴν δὲ δεξιὰν χεῖρα ἀνατεταμένην ἔχει κατὰ ἀνατολὰς στάσιν τῶν Περσῶν σημαίνων καὶ μὴ μεταβαίνειν ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς γῆς, διὰ τῆς ἀνατάσεως καὶ ἀπώσεως

42 Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 63 (R. Henry, ed., *Photius: Bibliothèque*, 8 vols. [Paris, 1959/77], 1:64–76); T. Hägg, *Photios als Vermittler antiker Literatur: Untersuchungen zur Technik des Referierens und Exzerpieren in der Bibliothek*, *Studia Uppsalsensia* 8 (Uppsala, 1975), 184–92; D. Rohrbacher, *The Play of Allusion in the Historia Augusta* (Madison, WI, 2016), 16.

43 One wonders with Flusin, “Remarques sur la tradition manuscrite du *De aedificiis*,” 17, why there are no traces of the *Buildings* in the *Excerpta Constantiniana* and the other treatises of Porphyrogenitus, although *De thematibus* is transmitted together with the *Buildings* in Vat. gr. 1065 and Leiden, Universiteit Leiden, Vulcanius 56. Mondrain, “Le *De thematibus*,” does not touch on the subject.

44 T. Preger, ed., *Patria Konstantinopoleos, Scriptorum originum Constantinopolitanarum* 2 (Leipzig, 1907; repr. New York, 1975), x; Cameron and Herrin, *Constantinople in the Early Eighth Century* 3–8; P. Manafis, (Re)Writing History in Byzantium: A Critical Study of Collections of Historical Excerpts (London, 2020), 53–54. Manafis establishes the manuscript's date (pp. 44–46), but seems to preclude the possibility that the sylloge is earlier than its only witness (pp. 59–60), with arguments that are in part circular and are generally unable to limit the date of the text to Constantine VII's reign.

τῆς χειρὸς βοῶν· στήτε καὶ μὴ πρόσω χωρεῖτε· οὐ γὰρ συνοίσει ὑμῖν.⁴⁵

While the blessed Justinian erected Hagia Sophia, he cleared the forecourt and paved with marble what had previously been the *gusteum*, what the fish market is called. He also erected an equestrian statue of himself atop a column. He holds in his left hand a globe, which has a cross affixed to it, with the underlying meaning that he had become master of the world because of his faith in the cross (the earth is a globe because it is of spherical shape, and the cross is the faith because the incarnate God had been nailed on it). He has his right hand stretched forth to the east, gesturing to the Persians to halt, and not to trespass into Roman land, commanding by raising and warding off with his hand, “Halt and do not go farther! For this will be of no benefit for you.”

The entry is clearly dependent on the *Buildings*, with the main difference being that the Eastern barbarians are designated Persians:

Καὶ φέρει μὲν χειρὶ τῇ λαίᾳ πόλον, παραδηλὼν ὁ πλάστης ὅτι γῆ τε αὐτῷ καὶ θάλασσα δεδούλωται πᾶσα, ἔχει δὲ οὔτε ξίφος οὔτε δοράτιον οὔτε ἄλλο τῶν ὅπλων οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ σταυρὸς αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τοῦ πόλου ἐπικείται, δι' οὗ δὴ μόνου τὴν τε βασιλείαν καὶ τὸ τοῦ πολέμου πεπóρισται κράτος. προτεινόμενος δὲ χεῖρα τὴν δεξιὰν ἐς τὰ πρὸς ἀνίσχοντα ἥλιον καὶ τοὺς δακτύλους διαπετάσας ἐγκελεύεται τοῖς ἐκείνη βαρβάροις καθῆσθαι οἴκοι καὶ μὴ πρόσω ἵεναι.⁴⁶

And he holds in his left hand a globe, the sculptor indicating thus that the earth and sea are subjugated to him in their entirety; yet he has no sword, spear, or weapon of any sort, but a cross is placed on his globe, as it is only through

45 *Anonymus Treu*: E. Zingg, ed., “Zum Verhältnis zwischen dem *Anonymus Treu* (Par. suppl. gr. 607a), Iohannes Lydos, *De mensibus* und Porphyrios, *De simulacris*,” *Wiener Studien* 133 (2020): 119–67, at 125; superseding M. Treu, ed., *Excerpta Anonymi Byzantini ex codice Parisino suppl. gr. 607a* (Ohlau, 1880), 5:1–14.

46 *Aed.* 1.2.11–12.

this that he has procured for himself both rulership and victory in war. And by stretching forth his right hand, with fingers spread, toward the rising sun, he orders the barbarians in that direction to stay at home and advance no farther.

The opening passage of this excerpt in the *Anonymus Treu* borrows from John Lydus's *De mensibus*.⁴⁷ An intermediary text between the two might, however, be reasonably assumed. It happens that the same information was also attached to the *Buildings* as a marginal gloss in both the long and the short recensions (Vat. gr. 1065, fol. 27r; Athens, Benaki Museum, MS 4, fol. 3v): μετετέθη ἡ λέξις γουστείων γὰρ καλοῦσι τὸ ὀψοπωλείον. There are two possible *prima facie* explanations for this occurrence: either the Lydus gloss was attached in the thirteenth or fourteenth century by a reader having the *Anonymus Treu* by his side or the *Anonymus Treu* already used a text of the *Buildings* with the Lydus gloss attached. In the latter case, the gloss must have been appended to the *Buildings* at a very early stage in the transmission, not only before the copying of Vat. gr. 1065, in the twelfth century but even before the *Anonymus Treu* in the ninth or tenth century.⁴⁸ Based on the gloss being in both recensions, Montinaro maintains that it had been juxtaposed to the archetype of the *Buildings* in the sixth century, after which it spread to the other recension and the *Anonymus Treu*.⁴⁹ This assertion runs counter to the fact that the Lydus etymologies in

the *Anonymus Treu* mainly refer to words with an initial α or β and that the intermediary source must have been a Lydus excerpt (gathering more from *De mensibus* and less from *De ostentis*) and not the *Buildings*.⁵⁰

At any rate, the cited entry in the *Anonymus Treu* was reproduced in the *Suda* and transformed into an entry on the Emperor Justinian.⁵¹ The *Patria*, when patched together from very different sources at the end of the tenth century, copied the text as well.⁵² Constantine the Rhodian also exhibits kinship with this entry of the *Anonymus Treu* in his description of the Holy Apostles and the *mirabilia* of Constantinople. This work is now considered to have been written during 914–919, at the time of the regency council for Constantine VII.⁵³ When praising the late antique triumphal columns of Constantinople, Constantine the Rhodian moves Justinian's column to the fore:⁵⁴

Καὶ τὸν σὺν αὐτῷ χαλκοσύνθετον στύλον χρυσο-
στεφῇ φέροντα λαμπρὸν ἰππότην, Ἰουστινιανὸν
ἐκείνον ἄνδρα τὸν μέγαν τὴν χεῖρ' ἐπεκτείνοντα

47 John Lydus, *De mensibus* 4.138 (R. Wuensch, ed., *Ioannis Lydi Liber de mensibus* [Leipzig, 1898], 163): Τῇ πέμπτῃ τοῦ Ὀκτωβρίου μηνὸς οἱ ῥεγεωνάρχαι καὶ σεβαστοφόροι ἐχόρευον ἐν τῷ Γουστείῳ, οἷον ἐν τῷ ὀψοπωλείῳ, εἰς τιμὴν Τιβερίου· τὸν δὲ τοιοῦτον τόπον νῦν οἱ ἰδιῶται Αὐγουστειὸν καλοῦσιν. This passage has to be detached from the subsequent text related to the Daphne in the palace. See E. Zingg, "Rund um den *Anonymus Treu* (Par. suppl. gr. 607a): Eine verwirrende Ecke im Stemma von Iohannes Lydos, *Peri menon*," *Byzantion* 89 (2019): 513–59, at 518–21 and 531–34. Γουστειὸν (*gustus) seems to be a hapax for a covered market offering food, a pun intended to mock the imperial cult offered to Tiberius juxtaposed to that of Augustus. Manafis, *(Re)Writing History* 57, mistakenly ascribes the entire excerpt to John Lydus. On this, see also Dagron, *Constantinople imaginaire*, 58; D. Feissel, "Tribune et colonnes impériales à l'Augusteion de Constantinople," *TM* 22.1 (2018): 121–55, at 124–50.

48 Flusin, "Remarques sur la tradition manuscrite du *De aedificiis*," 17, is inconclusive on the gloss deriving from the *Patria* or from John Lydus.

49 Montinaro, *Études sur l'évergétisme*, xxv–vi, and reiterated in Montinaro, "Power, Taste and the Outsider," 205.

50 Wuensch, *Ioannis Lydi Liber de mensibus*, x–xix. A. Berger, *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos*, Ποικιλὰ Βυζαντινὰ 8 (Bonn, 1988), 48, and Manafis, *(Re)Writing History*, 46–49. Of note, this *Anonymus Treu* excerpt is followed by a series of excerpts under the lemma Περί ἀγαλμάτων (see Odorico, "Du recueil à l'invention"); hence, the main reason for its inclusion in the sylloge was probably the gesture of Justinian's statue, with John Lydus's part used as a supplement.

51 *Suda*, I 446 (A. Adler, ed., *Suidae Lexicon*, 5 vols. [Leipzig, 1928/35], 2:644–45). Prinzing, "Bild Justinians," 84, highlights the significance of this entry for the image of Justinian.

52 *Patria Constantinopolitana* II.17 (Preger, *Patria Constantinopoleos*, 159; A. Berger, trans., *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople: The Patria*, DOML 24 [Cambridge, MA, 2013], 59).

53 L. James, *Constantine of Rhodes, On Constantinople and the Church of the Holy Apostles* (Burlington, 2012), 133–34. This date was first proposed by P. Speck, "Konstantinos von Rhodos: Zweck und Datum der Ekphrasis der Sieben Wunder von Konstantinopel und der Apostelkirche," in *Varia* 3, Ποικιλὰ Βυζαντινὰ 11 (Bonn, 1991), 249–68, at 259–61. This is also the date accepted by M. D. Lauxtermann, "Constantine's City: Constantine the Rhodian and the Beauty of Constantinople," in *Wonderful Things: Byzantium through Its Art*, ed. A. Eastmond and L. James (London, 2013), 295–308, at 299–300, and F. Bernard, "Constantine the Rhodian's Ekphrasis in Its Contemporary Milieu," in *The Holy Apostles: A Lost Monument, a Forgotten Project, and the Presentness of the Past*, ed. M. E. Mullett and R. G. Ousterhout (Washington, DC, 2020), 145–56, at 146–48.

54 Magdalino, "Distance of the Past," 128, n. 36, was the first to stress that Justinian's column precedes Constantine's here.

πρὸς τὸν ἀέρα καὶ “στῆθ’ ἅπαν,” φάσκοντα,
 “**βάρβαρον γένος**, Μῆδοί τε **Πέρσαι** καὶ τὸ
 τῆς Ἁγὰρ γένος, ἀρχῆς ἐμῆς **πόρρωθεν**, ἔξω
 τερμάτων, μήπως ἅπαντας ἐκ χθονὸς ἀμαλδύνω
 σταυροῦ φέρων τρόπαιον ἡγλαϊσμένον.”⁵⁵

And the pillar fabricated of bronze next to this [Hagia Sophia] supporting a gleaming horseman crowned with gold, Justinian being that great man, his hand stretched forth toward the sky, saying “Halt, every barbarian race, you Medes and Persians and the race of Hagar [Arabs], halt far away from my realm, outside its bounds, lest I, bearing the splendid trophy of the cross, efface you all from the earth.”

The text, due to its phrasing, is akin to the *Anonymus Treu*, but ancillary access to the *Buildings* cannot be excluded given the reintroduction of the reference to the barbarians:

Τὴν δὲ δεξιὰν χεῖρα ἀνατεταμένην ἔχει κατὰ ἀνατολὰς στάσιν τῶν Περσῶν σημαίνων καὶ μὴ μεταβαίνειν ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς γῆς, διὰ τῆς ἀνατάσεως καὶ ἀπώσεως τῆς χειρὸς βοῶν· **στῆτε καὶ μὴ πρόσω** χωρεῖτε.⁵⁶

Compare with *Aed.* 1.2.12:

Προτεινόμενος δὲ χεῖρα τὴν δεξιὰν ἐς τὰ πρὸς ἀνίσχοντα ἥλιον καὶ τοὺς δακτύλους διαπετάσας ἐγκελεύεται τοῖς ἐκείνῃ **βαρβάροις** καθῆσθαι οἴκοι καὶ μὴ **πρόσω** ἰέναι.

Constantine did not link to **Aed.* 1.4.9–23 in regard to his main objective,⁵⁷ the description of the church of the Holy Apostles, although he concurs with Procopius on many points. There is only one passage in which Constantine adopts a phraseology reminiscent of Procopius to describe the layout of the church:

... πενταστροφόμορφος, συγκροτούμενος κάραις τρισὶ<ν> μὲν **ὀρθαῖς**, ταῖς δυσὶ<ν> δ’ **ἐγκαρσῖαις**, δοκῶν ἅπασαν συμπερικλείειν πόλιν.⁵⁸

... formed like a five-pointed star, welded together with peaks [domes] of which three are set straight and two perpendicular, appearing to encase the whole city.

Compare with **Aed.* 1.4.11:

Εὐθεῖαι συνημμέναι κατὰ μέσον ἀλλήλαιν ἐπὶ σταυροῦ σχήματος πεποιήνται δύο, ἡ μὲν **ὀρθή** πρὸς ἀνίσχοντά τε καὶ δύοντα τὸν ἥλιον οὖσα, **ἐγκαρσία** δὲ ἡ ἑτέρα πρὸς τε ἄρκτον τετραμμένη καὶ ἄνεμον νότον.

And he carried out his pursuit in the following way: He drew two straight lines, attached to each other in the middle forming the shape of a cross; the first one going from east to west, the second perpendicular to the former and going in the direction of north to south.

This passage, though, cannot be considered veritable proof of Constantine’s knowledge of the *Buildings* in regard to the Holy Apostles. Of particular note, he ascribes to the church a very different shape—an edifice formed like a five-pointed star (pentalfa). Moreover, he claims to be the first to describe the Holy Apostles,⁵⁹ apparently being unaware of Procopius’s text. Thus, one can unequivocally rule out Constantine using the *Buildings*; rather, the meagre intertextuality with Procopius arose from an intermediary text also used in the *Anonymus Treu*.⁶⁰ Taken together, Constantine is a witness independent of Procopius for the early history of the Holy Apostles, confirming the latter’s claim that

58 Constantine the Rhodian, *Ekphrasis*, vv. 458–60 (Vassis, *Constantine of Rhodes*, 50).

59 Constantine the Rhodian, *Ekphrasis*, v. 412 (Vassis, *Constantine of Rhodes*, 46).

60 Given this link, the date of the sylloge of the *Anonymus Treu* must be placed earlier or close to the poem of Constantine the Rhodian, namely, earlier than the latter half of the tenth century assigned to it by Manafis, *(Re)Writing History*, 100–109; Manafis convincingly emphasizes that the *Anonymus Treu* processed earlier excerpt collections rather than citing original texts (p. 59).

55 Constantine the Rhodian, *Ekphrasis*, vv. 364–72 (I. Vassis, ed., in James, *Constantine of Rhodes*, 44).

56 Zingg, “Zum Verhältnis,” 125.

57 **Aed.* 1.4.11–20, the largest part of the description of the Holy Apostles, is missing in the short recension.

Justinian rebuilt the church (without Theodora receiving credit).⁶¹

Lacking solid historical information, Constantine drew on Paul the Silentiary's description of the Hagia Sophia after its rededication in 562. Thus, Constantine characterizes the selection of marbles of the Holy Apostles in a manner reminiscent of Paul's depiction of the Great Church,⁶² and he even presents Isidore the Younger or Anthemius as the architects of the Holy Apostles, because Paul mentions their names:⁶³

Ἀπάρχεται δὲ κτίσματος τοῦ παγκλύτου ὁ τόνδε ναὸν πανσόφως ἀπαρτίσας, εἴτ' Ἀνθέμιος εἴτ' Ἰσιδωρος νέος (τούτων γὰρ εἶναι τοῦργον ἐκδηλον τόδε ἅπαντες εἶπον ἱστορες λογογράφοι), κύβου χαράξας γραμμικὴν θεωρίαν.⁶⁴

He begun constructing the all-glorious building, he, who completed this church in the cleverest way, whether this was Anthemius or the younger Isidore (for all historical narrators said that this was clearly their work), after having marked out the linear form of a cube.

Ascribing the completion of the church to one or the other of the two architects—that is, without specifying one of them—indicates that Constantine did not refer to a reliable source. Instead, he was rather guessing, because he knew that the Holy Apostles was built sometime

between the first and second dedication of Hagia Sophia (537–562), when presumably both Anthemius and Isidore the Younger had reached their acme.⁶⁵

Having eliminated Constantine as having read the *Buildings*, one can equally and firmly say the same of Joseph Genesius and the author of the so-called *Theophanes continuatus* (both of whom flourished circa 950).⁶⁶ This is despite the emperors of the ninth and tenth centuries aspiring to emulate their fourth- to sixth-century predecessors in various ways, as Kaldellis aptly observes, noting that “their city, palace, and cathedral (Hagia Sophia) were all late antique constructions.”⁶⁷ The *Buildings*, however, stood in the background in the *Vita Basilii*, written a little later than the Rhodian's poem, on the authority of Constantine VII to honor his grandfather, Basil I, the founder of the Macedonian dynasty. This eulogy, even more so than *Theophanes continuatus*, has a thematic rather than a chronological arrangement. The *Vita Basilii* culls themes, motifs, and images from ancient literature, and in terms of organization, resembles a *basilikos logos*⁶⁸—and to a great extent reflects on Basil as the perfect ruler in the manner of a mirror-of-princes⁶⁹—insofar as it starts with the hero's origin, continues with his deeds in war and peace, extolls his physical prowess compared to that of ancient heroes, and then discloses his acts of charity and social welfare, including his construction and repair of

61 Constantine the Rhodian, *Ekphrasis*, vv. 494–505 (Vassiss, *Constantine of Rhodes*, 52).

62 Constantine the Rhodian, *Ekphrasis*, vv. 636–74 (Vassiss, *Constantine of Rhodes*, 62–64); C. A. Mango, *The Art of the Byzantine Empire, 312–1453: Sources and Documents* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1972), 199–201. Mango's use of Paul the Silentiary strongly supports the idea advanced by Lauxtermann, “Constantine's City,” 300 that the poem, which breaks off at verse 981, originally continued with an ekphrasis of Hagia Sophia. Constantine the Rhodian was familiar with Paul's poems since he likely was scribe J of Heidelberg, Bibliotheca Palatina, gr. 23, which contains them: A. Cameron, *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford, 1993), 300–307; M. D. Lauxtermann, “The Anthology of Cephalas,” in *Byzantinische Sprachkunst: Studien zur byzantinischen Literatur gewidmet Wolfram Hörandner zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. M. Hinterberger and E. Schiffer (Berlin, 2007), 194–208, at 196, n. 5; Bernard, “Constantine the Rhodian's Ekphrasis,” 155–56.

63 Paul the Silentiary, *Ekphrasis*, vv. 553–54 (Fobelli, *Un tempio per Giustiniano*, 68).

64 Constantine the Rhodian, *Ekphrasis*, vv. 548–53 (Vassiss, *Constantine of Rhodes*, 56).

65 *PLRE* 3:88–89, s.v. Anthemius 2 (fl. 530s, d. ca. 540). W. L. MacDonald, “Roman Architects,” in *The Architect: Chapters in the History of the Profession*, ed. S. Kostof (New York, 1977), 28–58, at 53; *PLRE* 3:724–25, s.v. Isidorus 5 (fl. 550s).

66 Joseph Genesius, *Historia* 3.13 (A. Lesmueller-Werner and I. Thurn, eds., *Iosephi Genesii regum libri quattuor*, CFHB 14 [Berlin, 1978], 47.10–15; A. Kaldellis, trans., *Genesios: On the Reigns of the Emperors*, ByzAus 11 [Canberra, 1998], 62), where Genesius digresses from his historical narrative to the city of Tarsus without using *Aed.* 5.5.14–19, as he would otherwise have mentioned that Tarsus had not always been an “island,” but had become such when Justinian created a second bed for the Kydnus River.

67 A. E. Kaldellis, “Late Antique Literature in Byzantium,” in *A Companion to Late Antique Literature*, ed. S. McGill and E. J. Watts (New York, 2018), 557–68, at 557.

68 It is not, however, a *basilikos logos*. See L. Van Hoof, “Among Christian Emperors: The *Vita Basilii* by Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus,” *JECrSt* 54 (2002): 163–83, esp. 168–71.

69 P. A. Agapitos, “Ἡ εἰκόνα τοῦ αὐτοκράτορα Βασιλείου Α' στη φιλομακεδονικὴ γραμματεία 959–867,” *Ἑλληνικά* 40 (1989): 285–322, at 311–17; R. J. H. Jenkins, “The Classical Background of the *Scriptores post Theophanem*,” *DOP* 8 (1954): 11–30, at 20–22.

churches.⁷⁰ The *Vita Basilii* exhibits intertextual relations with the *Buildings* on two levels. First, it alludes to the Kainourgion, a new audience hall that Basil constructed in the Great Palace, by delineating it like the *Buildings* does in describing the Chalke vestibule:

Ἄνωθεν δὲ τῶν κιόνων ἄχρι τῆς ὀροφῆς καὶ τὸ κατὰ ἀνατολὰς ἡμισφαίριον ἐκ ψηφίδων ὠραίων ἅπας ὁ οἶκος κατακεχρύσεται, προκαθήμενον ἔχων τὸν τοῦ ἔργου δημιουργὸν ὑπὸ τῶν συναγωνιστῶν ὑποστρατῆγων δορυφορούμενον, ὡς δῶρα προσαγόντων αὐτῷ τὰς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐαλωκυίας πόλεις.⁷¹

In the space above the columns up to the very ceiling and in the eastern semidome the whole building has been covered with beautiful golden mosaic cubes. The work's creator presides there from above, attended by his comrades-in-arms—his subordinate commanders—who offer to him as gifts the cities that had been conquered under him.

Compare with *Aed.* 1.10.15–16:

Ἐναβρύνεται δὲ ταῖς γραφαῖς ἡ ὀροφή πᾶσα, οὐ τῷ κηρῷ ἐντακέντι τε καὶ διαχυθέντι ἐνταῦθα παγεῖσα, ἀλλ' ἐναρμοσθεῖσα ψηφίσι λεπταῖς τε καὶ χρώμασιν ὠραῖσμέναις παντοδαποῖς· αἱ δὲ τὰ τε ἄλλα πάντα καὶ ἀνθρώπους ἀπομιμῶνται. ὅποια δὲ αὐτῶν τὰ γράμματα ἐστὶν ἐγὼ δηλώσω. ἐφ' ἐκάτερα μὲν πόλεμος τέ ἐστι καὶ μάχη, καὶ ἀλίσκονται πόλεις παμπληθεῖς πῇ μὲν Ἰταλίας, πῇ δὲ Λιβύης· καὶ νικᾷ μὲν βασιλεὺς Ἰουστινιανὸς ὑπὸ στρατηγοῦντι Βελισαρίῳ, ἐπάνεισι δὲ παρὰ τὸν βασιλέα, τὸ στράτευμα ἔχων ἀκραιφνὲς ὅλον ὁ στρατηγός, καὶ δίδωσιν αὐτῷ λάφυρα βασιλεῖς τε καὶ βασιλείας, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐξαίσια.

The whole ceiling prides itself on its pictures, not attached with wax melted and spread there, but fitted with small tesserae in all sorts

of beautiful colors. They faithfully represent all sorts of subjects, including men. I will now describe what sort of pictures these are. On either side, there is war and battle, many cities being captured, some in Italy, some in Libya, and the emperor Justinian is victorious thanks to his general Belisarius. The general returns to the emperor with his entire army intact, and he is offering to him the spoils, both kings and kingdoms, and everything that is considered extraordinary among men.

Here, the *Vita Basilii* adopted not only Procopian expression and phraseology, but an entire scene: both the Chalke vestibule and the Kainourgion included imperial representations of their builders in gold mosaic, depicting them triumphant after a recent war. In both instances, the emperor was offered conquered cities, as personifications, by his army commanders. The wording is so close in the panegyric that the *Buildings* has to be considered the literary model to the point that one might question whether the *Vita Basilii* provides a realistic description of the Kainourgion. It is equally possible, however, that the design of the Kainourgion incorporated a visual and ideological dialogue with the Chalke vestibule.

Having established that the *Vita Basilii* appropriates from the *Buildings*, one can detect the second and more elusive textual relationship between the two. At first glance, Basil had taken delight in repairing Justinianic churches in the capital. Is it possible, however, that the churches that had been (re)built in the sixth century had generally fallen into decay by the end of the ninth century? Examining the repairs reveals a sequencing of references to them similar to that in book 1 of the *Buildings* (table 1).

The text of the *Vita Basilii*, however, makes no overt connections to the *Buildings* for the churches in common, and the use of Procopius's work was probably not recognized by readers due to its obscurity. Closer inspection reveals that the *Vita Basilii* enumerates many additional churches as well, and the order of those in common is not always exactly the same as in the *Buildings*. Hence, a solid intertextual link cannot be established in this respect.

The *Vita Basilii* does, however, demonstrate unequivocal intertextuality with the *Buildings* when describing the constructions initiated by the emperor

70 *Vita Basilii* 78 (I. Ševčenko, ed. and trans., *Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur Liber quo Vita Basilii imperatoris amplexitur*, CFHB 42 [Berlin, 2011], 264).

71 *Vita Basilii* 89 (Ševčenko, *Chronographiae*, 288–90).

Table 1. Church Repair Sequence in the *Vita Basilii* and the *Buildings*

<i>Vita Basilii</i> , chapters	Restored churches	Churches in the <i>Buildings</i>
79	Hagia Sophia	1.1
80	Holy Apostles	1.4.9–24
	Mother of God at Pege	1.3.6–8
81	St. Mocius	1.4.27
	St. Anne	1.3.11
	St. Plato	1.4.27
82	St. Zoe	1.3.13
	St. Acacius	1.4.25
93	Archangel Michael (Σινάτορος ἐν τοῖς Στείρου)	1.3.14
	St. Lawrence	1.6.21
94	John the Baptist (Hebdomon)	1.8.15
	Archangel Michael (Sosthenion)	1.8.2

in the Great Palace. Ihor Ševčenko suggested that the author based this section on a list assembled from personal observation.⁷² The part of the text that deals with the colonnaded forecourt of the Nea Church invokes a passage from the *Buildings* describing the exedras of Hagia Sophia:

Ἦς μέσον μὲν κωνοειδὴς καὶ διάτρητος ἀνέστη-
κεν στρόβιλος, πέριξ δὲ **κιονίσκοι** λευκοὶ καὶ τὸ
ἐνδον ὑπόκενοι **χοροῦ σχῆμα** σῶζοντες **ὑφεστή-**
κασι στεφάνην ἄνωθεν ἔχοντες περιθέουσιν.⁷³

In the middle of the basin stands a perforated pine cone-shaped device; small white columns, hollowed inside, stand around it, forming a choral dancing group.

Compare with **Aed.* 1.1.35:

Τούτων δὲ δὴ ἐφ' ἐκάτερα **κίονες** ἐπ' ἐδάφους
εἰσίν, οὐδὲ αὐτοὶ κατ' εὐθὺ ἐστῶτες, ἀλλ' εἴσω κατὰ
σχῆμα τὸ ἡμίκυκλον ὥσπερ **ἐν χορῶ** ἀλλήλοις
ὑπεξιστάμενοι, καὶ αὐτῶν ὑπεράνωθεν οἰκο-
δόμημα μνηοειδὲς ἀποκρέμαται.

On either side of this, columns are placed on the pavement, and these too do not stand in

a straight line, but they draw back inward in the pattern of a semicircle as if giving way to each other in a choral dance, and above them is suspended a crescent shape.

Both texts use a combination of the four words *κίων*, *σχῆμα*, *χορός*, and *ὑπεξίστημι*, pointing to an intertextual connection. They share this *iunctura verborum*, a rhetorical motif that might have originated with the *Buildings* but does not necessarily peg the author of the *Vita Basilii* as having read the *Buildings* (long recension) in regard to this section. At any rate, the aforementioned intertextual links are sufficient proof for the use of the *Buildings*.

Symeon the Logothete is the first author who explicitly refers to the *Buildings* in his chronicle, written around 960.⁷⁴

Ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς πάμπολλα κτίσματα ἐποίη-
σεν θαυμαστά ἐκκλησιῶν τε καὶ πόλεων καὶ τὴν
πενταγέφυρον τοῦ Σαγάρου· ἅπερ Προκόπιος
ἱστορικὸς ἐν ὀκτὼ λόγοις ἀνεγράψατο.⁷⁵

74 C. Zuckerman, “Theophilos and Theophobos in Three Tenth-Century Chronicles: Discovering the ‘Common Source,’” *REB* 75 (2017): 101–50, at 102 (with references).

75 Symeon Magister, *Chronicle* 104.13 (S. Wahlgren, ed., *Symeonis magistri et logothetae chronicon*, CFHB 44 [Berlin and New York, 2006], 143.73–76). This passage is also found at redactor A, the so-called Leo Grammaticus, of Symeon's *Chronicle*

72 Ševčenko, *Chronographiae*, 9–10*.

73 *Vita Basilii* 85 (Ševčenko, *Chronographiae*, 276–78).

The same emperor [Justinian] erected numerous buildings: marvellous churches, cities, and the five-arched bridge of the Sagaros. This is what Procopius the historian wrote down in eight books.

The summary reasonably outlines the *Buildings*, but Symeon's assertion that Procopius's work encompasses eight books conflicts with the known six books. There is no hint whatsoever of there having been more than the six.⁷⁶ Most probably, Symeon confused the *Wars* with the *Buildings*. In fact, he never alludes directly to the *Buildings*.

Debate continues on whether Symeon the Logothete and Symeon the Metaphrast are one and the same, but it has been established that the chronicle predates the metaphrastic corpus of saints' lives.⁷⁷ Metaphrastes cited the *Buildings* in his version of the *Life* of St. Sabas where the saint pleads with Justinian for tax relief on behalf of Palestine to ease the rebuilding of damaged churches and monasteries, the erection of hospices, and the construction of a church of the Mother of God in Jerusalem. Moreover, he asks for the construction of forts next to his Laura to protect against Saracen incursions. To that point, Metaphrastes' material is entirely drawn from the *Life* of St. Sabas by Cyril of

Scythopolis,⁷⁸ but after that the text continues with reference to Procopius:

Περὶ τούτων δὲ μικροῦ πάντων καὶ Προκόπιος ὁ Καισαρεὺς ἐν γὰρ τῷ πέπτω λόγῳ τῶν περὶ τῶν Ἰουστινιανοῦ κτισμάτων αὐτῷ φιλοπονηθέντων κατὰ μέρος διαλαμβάνει, αὐτὸν τε τὸν κτισθέντα τῆς Θεοτόκου ναὸν πρὸς ἀκρίβειαν ἐξηγούμενος, κάλλος τε αὐτοῦ καὶ μέγεθος ὅμοιον εἶναι μηδενὶ λέγων καὶ Νέαν Ἐκκλησίαν αὐτὸν καλεῖσθαι, συνωδὰ Κυρίλλῳ, τῷ τὸν βίον ἐξ ἀρχῆς τοῦ θείου Σάββα συγγραφεμένῳ, φθεγγόμενος, πρὸς δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν κτισθέντων δύο οἰκῶν ἐκεῖνῳ συνηγορεῖ, τοῦ μὲν εἰς καταγωγὴν τῶν ξένων, τοῦ δὲ εἰς ἀνάπαυσιν τῶν νόσῳ πιεζομένων.⁷⁹

Regarding almost all of these matters, Procopius of Caesarea deals in detail in his fifth book about the *Buildings* of Justinian, divided into parts, explaining with exactitude how he built the church of the Mother of God, reporting that there is none similar to this one in beauty and size, and that it is called the New Church, saying similar things to Cyril, who was the first to write the *Life* of St. Sabas. He also agrees with him [Cyril] concerning the erection of two buildings, the one for the housing of strangers, the other for the remedy of those pressed by sickness.

Compare with *Aed.* 5.6.1–2:

Ἐν δὲ Ἱεροσολύμοις ἱερὸν τῇ θεοτόκῳ ἀνέθηκεν, ὥπερ ἄλλο εἰκασθῆναι οὐδὲν οἶόν τέ ἐστι. Νέαν Ἐκκλησίαν καλοῦσι τὸ ἱερὸν οἱ ἐπιχώριοι.

And in Jerusalem he dedicated a church to the Mother of God to which no other can be compared. The locals call this church the New Church.

(I. Bekker, ed., *Leonis Grammatici Chronographia*, CSHB 42 [Bonn, 1842], 130).

76 S. Wahlgren, trans., *The Chronicle of the Logothete*, TTB 7 (Liverpool, 2019), 110, n. 3, detects no oddness. Rubin, "Prokopios," 314, suggests that the *Buildings* was published in conjunction with the *Wars*, when it already spanned eight books. The line of argument in Montinaro, "Byzantium and the Slavs," 104–5, runs in the same direction, suggesting that the short recension was published with the first tranche of the *Wars* (encompassing seven books), but this would result in a total of thirteen, rather than eight, books (provided books 5 and 6 are counted separately although book 6 seems not to have been separated by Procopius). The *Wars*'s eight books plus the *Buildings* would amount to one book more.

77 A. P. Markopoulos, *Η χρονογραφία τοῦ Ψευδοσυμεών καὶ οἱ πηγές της* (Ioannina, 1978), 16, identifies the Logothete as Metaphrastes. According to C. Høgel, *Symeon Metaphrastes: Rewriting and Canonization* (Copenhagen, 2002), 61–81, esp. 80–81, Metaphrastes is identified as a certain *logothete tou dromou* and *magistros* who also worked on the *Menologium* between 976–1004, while the chronicler was dead by 963. A. Kazhdan and C. G. Angelidi, *A History of Byzantine Literature (850–1000)* (Athens, 2006), 235, distinguishes between the two, as does Wahlgren, *Symeonis magistri Chronicon*, 3–5.

78 Cyril of Scythopolis, *Life of Sabas*, 72 (E. Schwartz, ed., *Kyrrillos von Skythopolis*, TU 49 [Leipzig, 1939], 175; R. M. Price, trans., *Lives of the Monks of Palestine*, Cistercian Studies 114 [Kalamazoo, MI, 1991], 184–85).

79 *Vita Sabae metaphrastica* 189 (K. Koikylides, ed., *Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* [Jerusalem, 1905], 87). Flusin, "Remarques sur la tradition manuscrite du *De aedificiis*," 17.

And *Aed.* 5.6.25:

... ἄτερος μὲν ξένοις ἐνδημοῦσι καταλυτήριον,
ὁ δὲ δὴ ἕτερος ἀναπαυστήριον νοσοῦσι πτωχοῖς.

... one is to be lodgings for foreigners visiting,
the other shelter for the poor afflicted by illness.

Metaphrastes' reference to the *Buildings* in this passage serves to strengthen the credibility of Cyril's testimony,⁸⁰ and it is actually accurate from a historical point of view. Both Procopius and Cyril, while writing in the 550s, independently bear testimony to the Nea Church and the other Justinianic constructions in Jerusalem and affirm each other.

With Symeon the Metaphrast taking this investigation to the end of the tenth century, it seems appropriate at this point to adduce evidence from the *Suda*, which was compiled around the 970s or 980s. The biographical entry for Procopius in the *Suda*,⁸¹ although providing the first concrete evidence of the *Anecdota*, lacks an accounting of the *Buildings*. This omission does not, however, reflect the latest knowledge at the time, as the entry was certainly taken from an earlier lexicon of Greek authors. The entry is unlikely to have been derived from the lost *Onomatologos* of Hesychius Illustis, as he was a generation older than Procopius at the least.⁸² Most likely, the *Onomatologos* was updated sometime between the seventh century and the mid-tenth century,⁸³ and so it entered the *Suda*. Moreover,

as mentioned above, the redactor of the *Suda* transformed the *Anonymus Treu* excerpt on Justinian's column into a biographical entry on the emperor. Of more interest, the *Buildings* entered the lexicon through another route:

Πισός, καὶ Πινσός· **Πεσός** δὲ παρὰ Προκοπίῳ.⁸⁴

Support.⁸⁵ *Support* at Procopius.

Compare with *Aed.* 1.1.37:

Κατὰ δὲ τὰ τοῦ νεῶ μέσα λόφοι χειροποίητοι ἐπανεστήκασι τέσσαρες, οὓς καλοῦσι **πεσσούς**, δύο μὲν πρὸς βορρᾶν, δύο δὲ πρὸς ἄνεμον νότον, ἀντίοι τε καὶ ἴσοι ἀλλήλοις, κίονας ἐν μέσῳ ἐκάτεροι κατὰ τέσσαρας μάλιστα ἔχοντες.

And in the middle of the church, four man-made mounts have been erected, which they call supports, two towards the north and two towards the south, opposite and equal to each other, each pair having exactly four columns between them.

Procopius only used the term *πεσός* in the *Buildings*.⁸⁶

A further intertextual relationship can be discerned with the late tenth-century synaxarion of the Constantinopolitan Church, which incorporated a

80 M. Hinterberger, "Die Aneignung des Anderen: Die Viten des Kyrillos von Skythopolis bearbeitet von Symeon Metaphrastes. Beobachtungen zur Umarbeitungstechnik," *TM* 23.1 (2019): 333–51, at 336, shows that this is the only occurrence in the rewriting of Cyril's *Lives* where Symeon exhibits a meta-level of judgment.

81 *Suda*, Π 2479 (Adler, *Suidae Lexicon*, 4:210–11).

82 A. E. Kaldellis, "The Works and Days of Hesychios the Illustrios of Miletos," *GRBS* 45 (2005): 381–403, at 386–88. Quite a different view is entertained by A. Cameron, *Wandering Poets and Other Essays on Late Greek Literature and Philosophy* (Oxford, 2016), 266–73, who places Hesychius's acme in the 560s.

83 G. Zecchini, "La storia romana nella *Suda*," in *Il lessico Suda a la memoria del passato a Bisanzio*, ed. G. Zecchini (Bari, 1999), 75–88, at 86–87, argues that the inclusion of Menander Protector and Theophylact Simocatta warrants an update of the *Onomatologos* in the seventh century at the earliest. Cameron, *Wandering Poets*, 350, n. 66, assumes that neither of these entries derives from the *Onomatologos*, which he assigns to the late sixth century, and rejects the idea of an update altogether. W. T. Treadgold, *The Nature of the*

Bibliotheca of Photius, DOS 18 (Washington, DC, 1980), 53, proposes identifying Ignatius the Deacon as the compiler of the update in the years 842 to 845. This was convincingly deconstructed by J. Schamp, *Photios historien des Lettres: La 'Bibliothèque' et ses notices biographiques* (Paris, 1987), 53–68. The entry proves, however, that the *Anecdota* was recognized as a work by Procopius before the *Buildings* was.

84 *Suda*, Π 1645 (Adler, *Suidae Lexicon*, 4:135).

85 The architectural term *πεσός* and its variant *πινσός* designates particular piers that were used of a massive support—most often a wide arch or a dome—either permanently or temporarily. In the latter case, their use is during the construction process, and they are dismantled after completion.

86 Rubin, "Prokopios," 316, noticed the significance of this entry as the word *πεσός* does not occur in either the *Wars* or the *Anecdota*. Haury's persuading emendation *πεσσούς* is in opposition to the two main manuscripts of the long recension (V and L), both of which transmit *πεσούς*, a reading that the *Suda* accepted too. The emendation is based on *Aed.* 1.1.69 and 71, where the term appears again as *πεσσοί*.

short commemoration of Justinian.⁸⁷ Sometime in the eleventh or twelfth century, as preserved in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, gr. 1621, a summary of the emperor's achievements was added to the entry.⁸⁸ Prinzing persuasively connects the entry's expansion and the establishment of an attached fair in the 1110s.⁸⁹ Although no source can be definitively identified, as with commemorations of other emperors, the core elements are likely traceable to an earlier necrologium, in this case from the Mount Sinai monastery.⁹⁰ Ultimately, the information for the entry was drawn from the *Buildings* (*Aed.* 1.1.64 and 5.7.9), though without using the same phraseology:

Μνήμη τοῦ ὀρθοδόξου βασιλέως Ἰουστινιανοῦ. . . . Οὗτος κτίζει τὴν μεγάλην ἐκκλησίαν πολλοῖς ἀναλώμασι καὶ χρήμασιν ἐκκαινώσας ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ πολὺν ἄργυρον καὶ χρυσὸν καὶ πολλοῖς ἀναθήμασιν ἱεροῖς καὶ πέπλοις χρυσοῦφέσιν ἀναθεῖς ἐν αὐτῇ. οὗτος ἐν πάσῃ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Παλαιστίνῃ καὶ Συρίᾳ πάσῃ ἐκκλησίας ἐδείματο ἀριθμὸν ὑπερβαίνουσας. οὗτος ὁ αοίδιμος βασιλεὺς τὸ ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὄρει Σινᾷ φρούριον μεγαλοπρεπὲς ὠκοδόμησεν καὶ τοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ θεῖους ναοὺς

ἐντίμως οἰκοδομήσας ἐδόξασε· καὶ τὴν πανθαύμαστον ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἁγίου ὄρους τῆς ἁγίας κορυφῆς αὐτὸς ἐδείματο· καὶ χρημάτων εἰσόδους δαψιλῶς τοῖς ἐν τῷ Σινᾷ μοναστηρίοις καὶ πάσῃ τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Παλαιστίνῃ διακειμένοις σεμνεῖοις καὶ παρθενῶσιν ἀφθόνως ἐχορήγησε.⁹¹

Commemoration of the Orthodox Emperor Justinian. . . . He erected the Great Church, renovating it by many expenses and money, endowing it with much silver and gold for the holy vessels and the gold-woven robes. He erected innumerable churches throughout Egypt, Palestine and all over Syria. This very emperor of blessed memory built the magnificent fort on the holy Mt. Sinai and praised God by honorably building within it a church. He also built the wonderful church on the holy summit of the holy mountain. He also abundantly furnished the monastic institutions of Sinai with cash income, as he did plentifully to the monasteries and nunneries located throughout Egypt and Palestine.

Before we leave the eleventh century, Michael Psellus deserves attention. He has so far been entirely overlooked as a reader of the *Buildings*.⁹² In his review of Justinian, he showcases the emperor's three main achievements (see n. 5) and adds as a fourth the synod of 536. In his praise of Justinian's constructions, he briefly mentions roads:

Ὁδοὺς πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐτέμετο εὐπετεῖς.⁹³

He cut easy roads to the barbarian lands.

For this very short but odd remark, only one passage in the literary production of the sixth century can

87 He was celebrated on the anniversary of his death, 14 November, or on the following Sunday. See A. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie liturgiĭeskych rukopisej*, vol. 1 (Kiev, 1895), 23–24.

88 K. Kovalchuk, "The Founder as a Saint: The Image of Justinian I in the Great Church of St Sophia," *Byzantion* 57 (2007): 205–38, at 220–22. The famous lunette mosaic in the southwest vestibule depicting Justinian and Constantine presenting Hagia Sophia and the city to the Virgin and the Christ child has been recently dated to the time when repairs were conducted, that is, between the earthquake of 26 October 989 and the reopening on 13 May 994: L. Riccardi, "Alcune osservazioni sul mosaico del vestibolo sud-ovest della Santa Sofia di Costantinopoli," in *Vie per Bisanzio*, ed. A. Rigo, A. Babuin, and M. Trizio (Bari, 2013), 1:357–71 (with references to previous scholarship). On the dates, see C. A. Mango, "The Collapse of St. Sophia, Psellus and the *Etymologicum genuinum*," in *Γόνιμος: Neoplatonic and Byzantine Studies Presented to Leendert G. Westerink at 75*, ed. J. M. Duffy (Buffalo, 1988), 167–74, at 167–70. Previously, A. Schminck, "Rota tu volubilis: Kaisermacht und Patriarchenmacht in Mosaiken," in *Cupido legum*, ed. L. Burgmann, M. T. Fögen, and A. Schminck (Frankfurt, 1985), 211–34, at 229–33, assigned the mosaic to Leo VI.

89 Prinzing, "Bild Justinians," 23–24, as reported by Nicephorus Callistus, *Ecclesiastical History* 17.31 (PG 147:301).

90 *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae e codice Sirmondiano nunc Berolinensi*, adiectis synaxariis selectis opera et studio Hippolyti Delehaye (Brussels, 1902; repr. 1972), lxxv.

91 *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, cols. 229–30, lines 24–35.

92 Neither Prinzing, "Bild Justinians," nor Scott, "Narrating Justinian," includes Psellus in their analysis of Justinian's image in later historiography. The present author took note of it owing to discussions with his colleague Elodie Turquois, who is currently exploring the role of Psellus in the transmission of the *Buildings*.

93 Michael Psellus, *Historia Syntomos* 71 (W. J. Aerts, ed., *Michaelis Pselli Historia syntomos*, CFHB 30 [Berlin, 1990], 54).

reasonably be pinpointed as a source. It refers to the “barbarian people” of the Tzanoi in **Aed.* 3.6.11:

Τὰ τοίνυν δένδρα ἐκτεμὼν ἅπαντα, οἷσπερ τὰς ὁδοὺς ξυνέβαινε ξυμποδίζεσθαι, καὶ τὰς ἐκείνη δυσχωρίας μεθαρμοσάμενος, εὐπετεῖς τε αὐτὰς καὶ ἵππασίμους καταστησάμενος, ἐπιμίγνυσθαι αὐτοὺς κατὰ ταῦτα τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις καὶ προσχωρεῖν τῇ ὁμιλίᾳ τῶν πλησιοχώρων πεποίηκεν.

Accordingly, he [Justinian] cut down all the trees by which the roads chanced to be obstructed; and by transforming the rough terrain at that place and making them easy and fit for riding, he accomplished that they [the Tzani], like other men, mingled with other people and accede to intercourse with their neighbors.

Psellus’s interest was aroused by the trouble at the fringes of the empire. He uses barbarians as a catchall for groups that continuously opposed the emperors, and, opposed to the civilizing intention Procopius presents, he advertises a policy of keeping Romans and barbarians separate.⁹⁴ Since this passage is absent in the short recension, Psellus must have read the long one, and is the first author for whom we can assert that he definitely did so.

Kommenian Era

Intertextuality with the *Buildings* can be found at the time of Emperor Manuel I. Michael, known as a follower or relative of an unidentified man from Thessaloniki (ὁ τοῦ Θεσσαλονίκης), belonged to the clergy of the patriarchate, serving as the head (πρωτέκδικος) of the collegium of the *defensores ecclesiae*.⁹⁵ Sometime in the mid-twelfth century, he wrote a speech for the

inaugural feast (*encaenia*) of Hagia Sophia, celebrated on 25 December:

Τὰ δὲ μεταίχμια τούτων κίονες ὑψηλαί, αἱ μὲν ἐπ’ εὐθείαν ἰοῦσαι γραμμὴν, αἱ δὲ χορευτικῶς οἶον ὡς ἐπὶ κύκλου πρὸς ἀλλήλας παρεγκλινόμεναι, τῷ διαφόρῳ τῆς στάσεως καὶ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τὸ σχῆμα συνεξαμείβουσιν.⁹⁶

And in the spaces between are high columns, some in a straight line, others as it were in a dancing fashion inclining toward each other on a circle, mutually complementing the plan of the building by the difference in their stance.

Compare with **Aed.* 1.1.35:

Τούτων δὲ δὴ ἐφ’ ἐκάτερα κίονες ἐπ’ ἐδάφους εἰσίν, οὐδὲ αὐτοὶ κατ’ εὐθὺ ἐστῶτες, ἀλλ’ εἴσω κατὰ σχῆμα τὸ ἡμίκυκλον ὥσπερ ἐν χορῷ ἀλλήλοις ὑπεξιστάμενοι, καὶ αὐτῶν ὑπεράνωθεν οἰκοδόμημα μνηοειδὲς ἀποκρέμαται.

On either side of this, columns are placed on the pavement, and these too do not stand in a straight line, but they draw back inward in the pattern of a semicircle, as if giving way to each other in a choral dance, and above them is suspended a crescent shape.

And with *Aed.* 1.1.35, which misses parts of the long recension relevant for the intertextual links:

Τούτων δὲ δὴ ἐφ’ ἐκάτερα κίονες ἐπ’ ἐδάφους εἰσί.

In a fashion recalling the *Vita Basilii* regarding the same passage drawn from the *Buildings*, Michael compares the exedra columns of Hagia Sophia to a dancing chorus, clearly relying on Procopius. Since Michael’s speech uses some extra bits of the passage that are only found in the long recension, his can be considered the first unambiguous evidence of the transmission and reception of the long version.

In the twelfth-century Vat. gr. 1065, the main witness to the long recension of the *Buildings*, one can

94 Michael Psellus, *Ep.* 88 (S. Papaioannou, ed., Michael Psellus, *Epistulae* [Berlin, 2019], 187.22–188.60); see F. Lauritzen, “Nations and Minorities in Psellos’ *Chronographia* (976–1078),” *Studia Ceranea* 9 (2019): 319–31, esp. 328–29; A. E. Kaldellis, *Ethnography after Antiquity: Foreign Lands and Peoples in Byzantine Literature* (Philadelphia, 2013), 119–22.

95 J. Lefort, “Prooimion de Michel neveu de l’archevêque de Thessalonique, didascale de l’Évangile,” *TM* 4 (1970): 375–93, at 376; J. Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les Ὀφφίκια de l’église byzantine*, AOC 11 (Paris, 1970), 323–32; Prinzing, “Bild Justinians,” 15–17.

96 Michael, *Ekphrasis* 4 (J. Parker and C. A. Mango, eds., “A Twelfth-Century Description of St. Sophia,” *DOP* 14 [1960]: 238).

discern further resonance with Procopius's text in the marginalia of the copyist's hand.⁹⁷ He placed marginal headings next to many subchapters, yet in most instances, they are of no independent value. A passage on Antioch is, however, noteworthy:

Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἱερὸν ἐνταῦθα τῇ θεοτόκῳ πεποιήται μέγα. οὗ δὲ τό τε κάλλος καὶ τὸ ἐς ἅπαντα μεγαλοπρεπὲς ἐπελθεῖν λόγῳ ἀμήχανον· ὃ δὲ καὶ προσὸς ἐτίμησε χρημάτων μεγάλων.⁹⁸

Besides, he also built there a great church to the Mother of God. It is truly impossible to convey its beauty and magnificence in all respects. And he also awarded it with a large financial income.

The copyist, in a marginal heading on folio 51r, provides a variant name of a church:⁹⁹

Περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς ἁγίας θεοτόκου τῆς στρογγύλης.

About the round church of the holy Mother of God.

Thus, the copyist designates the church as the round one, apparently being aware of this structural detail. Malalas and Evagrius, like Procopius, mention it without any indication of its shape.¹⁰⁰ Arabic (kanīsat mudawwara Maryam) and Latin sources (S. Maria Rotunda) often referred to “the round one” as the church of Mary from the tenth century until

its destruction by an earthquake in June 1170.¹⁰¹ The copyist or the master copy must have shared certain knowledge about Antioch, possibly because he had been in the city for some time. Additional glosses shed further light on this twelfth-century copyist. On folio 28r, the Constantinopolitan xenon of Arcadius (attested only by Procopius) is identified as the xenon of Euboulos. This equation by a Byzantine hand had also been proposed by some modern scholars without knowledge of the gloss.¹⁰² Martyropolis is identified as Maipherkat (folio 54r and correct), and the city of Eurrhoi as Ioannina (folio 62r and debated). The glossator was unsure where to locate Justiniana Prima (folio 61r): ἡ Πρώτη Ἰουστινιανῇ πλησίον οὖσα τοῦ Δυρραχίου (Justiniana Prima which is close to Dyrrhachion).¹⁰³ There are also a few longer glosses by a later Palaiologan reader which are not elaborated here.¹⁰⁴

101 K.-P. Todt, *Region und griechisch-orthodoxes Patriarchat von Antiocheia in mittelbyzantinischer Zeit (969–1084)* (Wiesbaden, 2019), 417–19; W. Mayer and P. Allen, *The Churches of Syrian Antioch (300–638 CE)*, Late Antique History and Religion 5 (Leuven, 2012), 107–9, equates this church with a chapel of the Mother of God, where Severus of Antioch preached homilies 67 and 83 in the year 515.

102 Berger, *Untersuchungen zu den Patria*, 398–99; R. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine: Développement urbain et repertoire topographique*, 2nd ed., AOC 4a (Paris, 1964), 348–49.

103 This gloss should be contextualized with the concurrent evolution of the so-called Justiniana Prima theory of the Archiepiscopate of Ochrid, which positioned the Justinianic city foundation to either Velbazhd or Ochrid. Propagandists, however, drew on Justinian's Novels alone, without reference to the *Buildings*. On this, see G. Prinzing, “Entstehung und Rezeption der Justiniana-Prima-Theorie,” *Byzantinobulgarica* 5 (1979): 269–87, esp. at 269–74. The exact location of the city was discovered only through archaeology.

104 The glossator gives only generic information or quotes from known texts, and hence does not broaden our knowledge of the *Buildings*'s afterlife. On folio 31r (attached to *Aed.* 1.5.2, where the Bosphorus is described without any mention of Chrysopolis), the glossator quotes Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History* 7.25.13 (G. C. Hansen, ed., *Sokrates, Kirchengeschichte*, GCS, N.F., 1 [Berlin, 1995], 373–74), where the mouth of the Bosphorus and Chrysopolis's early history are discussed. On folio 66r (at the end of the list in *Aed.* 4.4), he transitions into an excursus about Adrianople: ἀμέτοχος ἔστιν ἡ εἰδησις αὐτῇ τῆς ἔσωθεν ὑφῆς τῶν ἀπηριθμημένων φρουρίων· ἐγγραφὴ δὲ αὐτῇ δι' εἰδὴ Πείρι[ν]θος μέντοι ἡ Ἡράκλεια· κατὰ Θράκην λέγεται: ἡ δὲ Ἀδριανούπολις κεῖται παρὰ τῷ Αἰῶνι ὅρει· καθὰ συμβαίνει μίγνυσθαι τῷ Εὐρῷ ποταμῷ καὶ τῷ Ἀρζῷ καὶ Ἀρτακον ἐν οἷς λέγεται τὸν Ὀρέστην ἐν τῇ μίξει τῶν τριῶν λούσασθαι ποταμῶν καὶ τὴν δαιμονιώδη ἀποθέσθαι μανίαν. ἔνθα καὶ δειμάσας φασὶ πόλιν ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου ὀνόματος Ὀρεστιάδα προσαγορεῦσαι. ἥν ὕστερον Ἀδριανὸς ὁ

97 An opinion shared with Haury, “Über Prokophandschriften,” 174.

98 *Aed.* 2.10.24.

99 First noted by Flusin, “Remarques sur la tradition manuscrite du *De aedificiis*,” 16.

100 Malalas, *Chronicle* 17.19 (I. Thurn, ed., *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*, CFHB 35 [Berlin, 2000], 351); Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History* 5.21 (J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, eds., *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius* [London, 1898, repr. 1979], 2:270; Whitby, *Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*, 283). Malalas's testimony makes it clear that the church had been built right after the 526 earthquake and before the Sasanian conquest of 540. Procopius inserted his passage on the church after a long report on the rebuilding of Antioch post-540 without signaling that it had in fact been built well before 540. Evagrius remarks that the Antiochenes call it the church of Justinian: ἱερὸς οἶκος τῆς ἁγίας καὶ πανάγνου πατρὸς θενοῦ καὶ θεοτόκου Μαρίας, ὃς πρὸς τῶν θεουπολιτῶν Ἰουστινιανοῦ προσηγόρευται.

Sometime before 1204, Nicholas Mesarites, a member of Hagia Sophia's clergy who also served as the sceuphyllax of the Palatine churches, composed an encomium for Patriarch John X Camaterus (1198–1206) that contains a description of the church of the Holy Apostles. Apart from a description of the purpose of the mausoleum of Constantine that concurs with the one of Procopius (and lacks exclusive knowledge),¹⁰⁵ there is no evidence for intertextuality with Procopius.¹⁰⁶

βασιλεὺς Ῥωμαίων ἐν περιβάλοις αὐξήσας καὶ ἄλλοις ἔργοις ἐπιφανέσιν Ἀδριανούπολιν μετωνόμασεν. This Adrianople excursus paraphrases the late tenth-century *Chronicle* of Pseudo-Symeon (I. Bekker, ed., *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus*, CSHB 31 [Bonn, 1838], 686.20–687.2) or respectively Theophanes continuatus, *Chronicle* 6.8 (Bekker 387.19–22), essentially an excerpt also worked on by John Tzetzes, *History* 8.2.47 (P. L. M. Leone, ed., *Ioannis Tzetzæ Historiae*, 2nd ed. [Galatina, 2007], 341–42). While M. Billerbeck and A. Neumann-Hartmann, eds., *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica*, CFHB 43.1 (Berlin, 2006), 30*, propose to trace the excerpt back to Strabo (disregarding the part on Hadrian), A. Diller, “The Tradition of Stephanus Byzantius,” *TAPA* 69 (1938): 333–48, at 333–35, and “Excerpts from Strabo and Stephanus in Byzantine Chronicles,” *TAPA* 81 (1950): 241–53, at 243–48, assigns it to the unabridged text of the *Ethnica* of Stephanos Byzantios. J. Nollé, “Zu den Gründungstraditionen des thrakischen Hadrianopolis (Edirne),” *Chiron* 39 (2009): 101–61, esp. 125–26, does not consider the textual tradition but recontextualizes the early history of the city as found in the excerpt. I am indebted to Georgi Parpulov, University of Birmingham, without whose kind assistance I would not have been able to read these glosses.

105 Nicholas Mesarites, *Ekphrasis* 39.1–2 (G. Downey, ed., “Nikolaos Mesarites: Description of the Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople,” *TAPS* 47 [1957]: 915; M. Angold, trans., *Nicholas Mesarites: His Life and Works*, TTB 4 [Liverpool, 2017], 125).

106 The mid-twelfth-century orator Philagathus of Cerami is posited with drawing on the *Buildings* by Maria L. Fobelli, “L’ekphrasis di Filagato da Cerami sulla Cappella Palatina e il suo modello,” in *Medioevo: I modelli*, ed. A. C. Quintavalle (Milan, 2002), 267–75, at 268. Philagathus was a monk at the monastery Nea Hodegetria/Patirion (nearby Rossano) and a prolific church preacher in the Norman Kingdom of Sicily. The ekphrastic motifs in Philagathus’ Homily 27 and the *Buildings*, 1.1.47–48 and 1.1.59–63, indeed exhibit kinship: the beholder is never satiated with the sight of the church (chap. 1); the church pavement compares to a meadow in springtime (chap. 2); and Philagathus details the offerings to the sanctuary (chap. 3). Such a recurrence of themes does not, however, prove Philagathus drawing from the *Buildings*. In fact, Philagathus at no instance borrows from Procopius, but merely takes up long-established motifs of church ekphraseis. A much more probable model for Philagathus is Leo VI’s homily 37, as convincingly shown by T. Antonopoulou, “Philagathos Kerameus and Emperor Leo VI: On a Model of the Ekphrasis of the Cappella Palatina in Palermo,” *Νέα Πώμη* 12 (2015): 115–27, esp. 122–23.

Palaiologan Era

George Pachymeres used the *Buildings* in one of his *progymnasmata* composed circa 1275–80.¹⁰⁷ In it he devised a long and well-known ekphrasis on the Augusteum and, with that, on Justinian’s column, especially the horse on it:

Βάθρον ἐκ γῆς ὑπανέχει τὴν κίονα, τὸ δὲ βάθρον κλίμακες μέχρι καὶ εἰς ἐπτὰ βαθμίδας λευκῆς μαρμάρου ἀνωκοδόμηται.¹⁰⁸

The column is supported on the ground by a base; the base has stairs of seven steps of white marble.

Compare with **Aed.* 1.2.1:

Ἐνταῦθα ξυνθήκαι λίθων οὐχ ἦσσαν ἢ ἐπτὰ ἐν τετραγώνῳ πεποιήνται, κατὰ μὲν ἀπόβασιν ξυγκείμεναι πᾶσαι, τοσοῦτον δὲ ἐκάστη τῆς ἔνερθεν οὔσης ἐλασσουμένη καὶ ἀποδέουσα.

There, an edifice has been erected with no less than seven rectangular courses of stone, all fitted to each other from their base, each being narrower and more reduced than the one below.

Ἐντεῦθεν ὁ στύλος ἐπωκοδόμηται, πάλαι μὲν ὡς ἀκούωμεν, κεκαλυμμένος ποικίλῳ τεμεσίῳ χαλκῷ, εἰ δὲ πιστευτέον τῷ λέγοντι, οὐ πολλῷ καὶ ἀργύρου δέοντι, νῦν δὲ γυμνὸς τὸ παράπαν φαινόμενος. . . . τὸ δὲ ἵππος ἐστὶ χαλκοῦς, θαυμαστῶς τοῦ σχήματος ἔχων, καὶ ἥκιστα παρορᾶσθαι τοῖς παριοῦσιν ἄξιός, εἰ καὶ πολλάκις τις τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκεῖσε διέρχοιτο.

107 M. Augerinou, “Ἐκφρασὶς τοῦ Αὐγουστεῶνος,” *Ἑλληνικά* 60 (2010): 343–51, provides a superficial analysis of the textual relation between Pachymeres and Procopius. See also S. Lampakes, *Γεώργιος Παχυμέρης, πρωτεύδικος καὶ δικαιοφύλαξ: Εἰσαγωγικὸ δοκίμιο* (Athens, 2004), 147–48.

108 George Pachymeres, *Progymnasma* 11 (C. Walz, ed., “Ἐωργίου τοῦ Παχυμέρους προγυμνάσματα,” in *Rhetores graeci* [Tübingen, 1832; repr. Osnabrück, 1968], 1:579–83); with few recent emendations by E. Amato and M. Deroma, “Per il testo dei Progimnasmata di Giorgio Pachimere: Collazione di uno sconosciuto testimone athonita,” *Medioevo Greco* 15 (2015): 43–49, based on a better manuscript.

On it [the base] the column is erected, which was in the past, as we are told, covered by variegated Temesian brass plates; if trusting his statements, it was not much inferior to silver, but now the whole appears bare. . . . The horse is made of brass, has an admirable design, and is in no respect deserving of being ignored for the ones passing by, even when they chance to go by there several times during the day.¹⁰⁹

With *Aed.* 1.2.4:

Ὁ δὲ χαλκὸς οὗτος τὸ μὲν χρῶμά ἐστι χρυσοῦ ἀκιβδήλου πρῶτος, τὴν δὲ ἀξίαν οὐ παρὰ πολὺ ἀποδέων ἰσοστάσιος ἀργύρῳ εἶναι.

And the color of this brass is softer than pure gold, and its value not much less than its equal weight in silver.

Εἰ δὲ που σὺν ταύτῃ καὶ τὸν ἀριστερὸν τῶν ἐμπροσθίων ἰδοὺ ποδῶν, πῶς κατὰ γόνυ κυρτοῦται, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐρηρυσμένων εἰς γῆν αὐτὸς μόνος ἥρηται, εἴποις ἂν κινεῖσθαι δὴ καὶ τὰ ἄψυχα.

If one beholds his left front leg, how he bends the knee and raises only this, while the other [legs] stand firm on the ground, you may be tempted to say that even the inanimate is moving.

With *Aed.* 1.2.6:

Ποδῶν τῶν προσθίων ἀμέλει τὸν μὲν ἀριστερὸν μετεωρίζει, ὡς ἐπιβησόμενον τῆς ἐπίπροσθεν γῆς, ὁ δὲ δὴ ἕτερος ἐπὶ τοῦ λίθου ἡρήρεται, οὐ ὑπερθέον ἐστίν, ὡς τὴν βᾶσιν ἐκδεξόμενος.

As for his forefeet indeed, he holds the left one up, as if he were about to take a step on the ground in front of him, while the other is poised on the stone upon which he stands, as if anticipating his next step.

Οἶον δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς κράνος, ὡς μηδὲν ἐπικαλύπτειν καὶ τὸν φοροῦντα κοσμεῖν.

But of what kind is the helmet on his head which does not cover it at all and adorns the wearer?

And with *Aed.* 1.2.9

Εἶτα ἡρωϊκῶς τεθωράκισται καὶ κράνος αὐτῷ τὴν κεφαλὴν σκέπει δόξαν ὡς κατασείοιτο παρεχόμενον, αἴγλη τέ τις ἐνθένδε αὐτοῦ ἀπαστράπτει.

And he is cuirassed in the heroic manner, and a helmet covers his head and gives the impression of moving up and down, and a beam of light flashes forth from it.

This is followed by a long passage that must be adduced to dispel any lingering doubts about Pachymeres citing Procopius:

Ἀνῆπται δὲ καὶ μανδύαν ἐκτὸς, στολὴν, ὡς φασιν, Ἀχιλλεῖον, ἣ καὶ τινα καλύπτουσα τῶν μερῶν κάκειθεν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀριστερὸν ὦμον ἐπικειμένη φθάνει, καὶ μέχρι τῆς τοῦ ἵππου ἰξύος, πολὺ τε μέρος περιλαμβάνει τῶν ὀπισθεν, καὶ περιττὴ περικέχεται· αἱ μέντοι χεῖρες τῷ ἀνδριάντι οὐκ ἀσχολοῦνται περὶ τὸν ἵππον, οὐδ' ὅσον καὶ ἰθύνειν ἱππηλάτου τρόπον δοκεῖν, ἀλλὰ τὴν μὲν δεξιὰν ὕψους ἀνατείνει, καθόσον οἶόν τε, μετὰ τινος ἀρεῖκου καὶ γενναίου φρονήματος· καὶ ἐμβριθῶς ἀπειλουμένῳ ἔοικε τοῖς ἐχθροῖς· πλὴν οὐκ ἐξ ἀπονοίας τινὸς καὶ θράσους ἀλόγου, ὡς ἂν οἰηθεῖ τις, φθάνει γὰρ ἡ λαιὰ, τὴν δεινὴν ταύτην ἀναιρουσα δόξαν καὶ ὑπεραπολογουμένη τάνδρὸς ἐς τὰ μάλιστα· κατέχει γὰρ ἐπὶ ταύτης μικρὸν ἀπεχούσης τοῦ σώματος μῆλον χαλκοῦν ἐπίχρυσον, ἐφ' οὗ καὶ σταυρὸς ὁμοίως ἔχων τῆς ὕλης ἵσταται, καὶ ἔοικε δεικνύειν ὁ θατέραν ἐκτετακῶς καὶ μετ' ἐμβριθοῦς ἀπειλούμενος σχήματος, ὥθ' ἰσχυρῶς ἀπειλεῖται, ὅτι καὶ τὸ μῆλον εἰκονίζειν ἔχει τὸν κόσμον, ὃν καὶ χειρὶ περισχεῖν πάσης γῆς ἀναψάμενος τὸ κράτος δυνάμει τεθάρρηκε τοῦ σταυροῦ.

He is wearing in addition to the cloak a jerkin, as they call it, in the guise of Achilles, which

109 Temesian brass (*Od.* 1.184) is identified as being white. See Augerinou, “Ἐκφράσεις,” 349, n. 44.

covers him in part and rests on the left shoulder, extending to the loin of the horse, encompassing for the most part the back, and flows over in surplus. The hands of the statue are not occupied with the horse, not in the manner a rider appears to steer, but his right hand is stretched forth aloft, as somebody with a warlike and noble mind who appears to vehemently threaten the enemies. This is not because of some kind of recklessness or fatuous boldness, like one might believe, because the globe confutes this terrible impression and certainly vindicates the man. Because he holds in that hand, which he extends a little from the body, this gilded apple made of brass upon which is set a cross made of the same material, and by stretching the other hand in a posture threatening violence, he seems to indicate whom he trusts; that is, as the apple represents the world, resting in his hand, he rules over the whole world, because he places his trust in the power of the cross.

And in *Aed.* 1.2.7 and 11–12:

Τούτῳ δὴ τῷ ἵππῳ χαλκῇ ἐπιβέβηκε τοῦ βασιλέως εἰκὼν κολοσσῶ ἐμφερής. ἔσταλται δὲ Ἀχιλλεύς ἢ εἰκὼν. . . . καὶ φέρει μὲν χειρὶ τῇ λαιᾷ πόλον, παραδηλὼν ὁ πλάστης ὅτι γῆ τε αὐτῷ καὶ θάλασσα δεδούλωται πᾶσα, ἔχει δὲ οὔτε ξίφος οὔτε δοράτιον οὔτε ἄλλο τῶν ὀπλῶν οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ σταυρὸς αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τοῦ πόλου ἐπίκειται, δι' οὗ δὴ μόνου τήν τε βασιλείαν καὶ τὸ τοῦ πολέμου πεπόρισται κράτος. **προτεινόμενος δὲ χεῖρα τὴν δεξιὰν** ἐς τὰ πρὸς ἀνίσχοντα ἥλιον καὶ τοὺς δακτύλους διαπετάσας ἐγκελεύεται τοῖς ἐκείνῃ βαρβάρους καθῆσθαι οἴκοι καὶ μὴ πρόσω ἰέναι.

On this bronze horse is mounted a colossal statue in the emperor's likeness. And the statue is outfitted in the guise of Achilles. . . . And he holds in his left hand a globe, the sculptor suggesting thus that the Earth and Sea are subjected to him in their entirety, yet he has no sword, spear, or weapon of any sort, but a cross is placed on his globe, as it is through this alone that he has procured for himself both rule and victory in war. And stretching forth his right hand toward the rising sun with fingers spread,

he orders the barbarians in that direction to stay at home and not advance any closer.

Although citing extensively from the *Buildings*, Pachymeres was highly selective in his allusions to it and never refers to Procopius by name. Although the parallels with Procopius are evident, they are not at the expense of the individuality of Pachymeres' account because he added his own observations and deviated quite a bit from the ekphrasis of Procopius, with whom he presumes his audience to be familiar given that he signals his allusion by stating *πάλαι μὲν ὡς ἀκούωμεν εἰ πιστευτέον τῷ λέγοντι* (as it was in the past, as we are told, if trusting his statements). Since Pachymeres spent most of his life in the city center, he could have obtained most of the information without having read Procopius. His references to Achilles, however, and the occasional adoption of Procopian word order discloses his use of the *Buildings*.

By emulating and updating Procopius, Pachymeres was attempting to conform to the stylistic tastes and parlance of his time. For instance, he transforms the imperial orb—*πόλος*, at the time an outdated term—into a gilded apple made of brass (*μῆλον χαλκοῦν ἐπίχρυσον*) for ease of understanding. Regarding the headdress of the statue, Pachymeres picks up on Procopius's description but transforms it into something different. He describes a diadem plumed with peacock feathers, yet in close alignment with Procopius calls it a helmet (*κράνος*). In this he melds Procopius's description of the headdress with his particular perspective of it. It is unclear whether this was due to a possible replacement of the earlier headdress in the intervening seven centuries or simply to his differing perception.¹¹⁰

Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulus is another author who evinces an abundance of intertextuality with Procopius. An ordained priest at Hagia Sophia, he served as librarian of the patriarchate and wrote

110 On the hypothesis of a replacement headdress, see C. A. Mango and P. Williams Lehmann, "Letter to the Editor," *ArtB* 41 (1959): 351–58, at 351–52, also in C. A. Mango, "The Columns of Justinian and His Successors," in idem, *Studies on Constantinople* (Aldershot, 1993), X, 1–20, at 6; on a possible change in perception, S. Sande, "The Equestrian Statue of Justinian and the σχῆμα Ἀχιλλείου," *Acta IR Norv* 6 (1987): 91–111, at 101–2.

his *Ecclesiastical History* around 1320.¹¹¹ He is the first Byzantine author to excerpt long sections of the *Buildings* in his work. In fact, he attributed sufficient prestige to this work by Procopius that he quotes it by name. In dealing with Procopius's oeuvre, however, he characterizes the *Buildings* as a minor work by him and provides a reasonably accurate summary of it:

... τὸ δὲ κτίσματα προσεπέγραψεν· ὅσα δῆτα Ἰουστινιανὸς ᾤκοδόμησε, μάλα γενναίως ἐκφράζων· νεῶς τε καὶ βασιλείους οἴκους, ἅσπερ τε καὶ πόλεις, γεφύρας τε καὶ ἄλλα ἐς κοινὴν χρῆσιν ἐξευρημένα.¹¹²

... in addition, Procopius wrote the *Buildings*, where he describes in a very noble way how much Justinian has built: churches and imperial palaces, towns and cities, bridges and other inventions for public benefit.

Nicephorus's first allusion occurs in the prooemium of *Ecclesiastical History* where he praises the never-resting care of Emperor Andronicus II, to whom the work is dedicated. He draws from a section in the *Buildings* where the same virtue is conceded to Justinian:¹¹³

Ὡστε δὴ θεοφιλῶς διαχειρίζειν τὰ πράγματα, ὀρθρὸς τε καὶ μεσημβρινός, καὶ οὐδέν τι ἤττον ἐπινυκτίδιος. ἐπὶ πόρρῳ γὰρ νυκτὸς, μᾶλλον δὲ τό γε πλείστον ἄρτι διαυγαζούσης ἡμέρας εἰς κοίτην ἰὼν, θάττον αὖθις ἀνίστατο, ὥσπερ χαλεπῶς τοῖς στρώμασιν ἔχων, καὶ οὐδὲ τότε σοι τοῦ πονεῖν ἄνεσις, ἦν, ὕπνοις δῆτ' ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ὀνείρασι κάμνοντι.¹¹⁴

111 H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 12.2 (Munich, 1959), 705–6; *PLP*, no. 20826; S. Panteghini, “Die Kirchengeschichte des Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos,” *OKS* 58 (2009): 248–66, at 251–52. A critical edition is currently being prepared by Christian Gastgeber, Sebastiano Panteghini, Vratislav Zervan, and Albrecht Berger for the CFHB series.

112 Nicephorus Callistus, *Ecclesiastical History* 17.10 (PG 147:244).

113 For analysis, B. Croke, “Justinian the ‘Sleepless Emperor,’” in *Basileia: Essays on Imperium and Culture in Honour of E. M. and M. J. Jeffreys*, ed. G. Nathan and L. Garland, *ByzAus* 17 (Brisbane, 2011), 103–8.

114 Nicephorus Callistus, *Ecclesiastical History*, prooemium (PG 145:572).

Thus, he manages the affairs in a God-loving manner, whether at dawn or noon, and no less during the night. Late at night, or rather more often early in the day, he went to bed, swiftly rising again as if the sheets felt hard to him, and relaxation caused him pain; it is said that he suffers in his sleep and dreams.

Compare with *Aed.* 1.7.8–9 = **Aed.* 1.7.8–9:

Διοῖν γὰρ ἡμέραιν διεγεγόνει ἐς αἰὲ ἀπόσιτος ὢν, καὶ ταῦτα ὀρθρου μὲν βαθέος ἐκ τῶν στρωμάτων ἐξανιστάμενος καὶ προεγρηγορῶς τῆς πολιτείας, αἰεὶ τε αὐτῆς ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ διαχειρίζων τὰ πράγματα, ὀρθρὸς τε καὶ μεσημβρινός, καὶ οὐδέν τι ἥσσον ἐπινυκτίδιος. πόρρῳ γὰρ τῶν νυκτῶν ἐς κοίτην ἰὼν ἐξανίστατο αὐτίκα δὴ μάλα, ὥσπερ χαλεπῶς τοῖς στρώμασιν ἔχων.

In fact, he spent two days without eating at all, constantly rising from his bed at the break of day and watching over the state, and perpetually managing its affairs by word and deed, whether at dawn or noon, and no less during the night. And though he was going to bed late at night, he would instantly rise again as if the sheets caused him pain.

In a paper devoted to that exordium, Eleni Kaltsogianni notes that the genre of imperial encomia flourished on an almost unprecedented scale during the Palaiologan period,¹¹⁵ and in the process earlier encomia were exhaustively utilized. That Nicephorus absorbed the panegyrist Procopius, however, escaped Kaltsogianni's attention. Another intertextual link concerns the Pega church, which Nicephorus describes before extolling Andronicus's care for the shrine:

Ὁ δ' αὐτὸς [Leo I] καὶ νεῶν ἕτερον ἐν χώρῳ ἐπιλεγομένῳ Πηγῇ ἀνετίθει τῇ Θεομήτορι· ἐνθα καὶ δάσος κυπαρίττων ἀμφιλαφές, ἦν, λειμῶν ἐν

115 E. Kaltsogianni, “Nikephoros Xanthopoulos und die Kaiserpanegyrik: Das Bild Kaiser Andronikos' II. in der Dedicatio der Historia ecclesiastica und seine literarischen Vorbilder,” in *Ecclesiastical History and Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos*, ed. C. Gastgeber and S. Panteghini (Vienna, 2015), 109–23; D. G. Angelov, *Imperial Ideology and Political Thought in Byzantium, 1204–1330* (Cambridge, 2007), 102–10.

ἀπαλαῖς ταῖς ἀρούραις τεθελῶς ἄνθεσι, παρά-
δεισος εὐφορῶν τὰ ὠραῖα, πηγὴ ἀψοφητὶ βλύ-
ζουσα γαληνὸν τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ πότιμον, ἱεροπρεπῇ
ἐπιεικῶς πάντα. ταῦτα δὲ ἄμφω τὰ ἱερὰ πρὸ τοῦ
τῆς πόλεως πεποιήται τείχους ἀνέστη, τὸ μὲν ἐν
Βλαχέρναις ἀρχομένῳ παρὰ τὴν τῆς θαλάσ-
σης ἡϊόνα, τὸ δὲ ἄγχιστά πη τῶν Χρυσῶν
καλουμένων Πυλῶν, ἃς δὴ ἄμφι τὸ τοῦ ἐρύμα-
τος πέρασ συμβαίνει εἶναι, ὅπως δὴ ἄμφω ἀναν-
ταγώνιστα φυλακτῆρια τῆς πόλεως εἶεν.¹¹⁶

Compare with *Aed.* 1.3.6–9 = **Aed.* 1.3.6–9:

Ἔτερον δὲ ἱερὸν αὐτῇ ἐν χώρῳ καλουμένῳ
Πηγῇ ἀνέθηκεν. ἐνταῦθά ἐστι δάσος κυπαρίσ-
σων ἀμφιλαφές, λειμῶν ἐν ἀπαλαῖς ταῖς
ἀρούραις τεθελῶς ἄνθεσι, παράδεισος εὐφορῶν
τὰ ὠραῖα, πηγὴ ἀψοφητὶ βλύζουσα γαληνὸν τὸ
ὑδωρ καὶ πότιμον, ἱεροπρεπῇ ἐπιεικῶς πάντα.
ταῦτα μὲν ὁ ἄμφι τὸ τέμενος χώρος αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν
νεῶν οὐδὲ ὀνόμασιν ἐπαξίοις συλλαβεῖν ῥάδιον,
οὐδὲ διανοίᾳ σκιαγραφῆσαι, οὐδὲ διαψιθυρίσαι
τῷ λόγῳ. τοσοῦτον δὲ μόνον εἰπεῖν ἀποχρήσει,
ὥς τῶν ἱερῶν κάλλει τε καὶ μεγέθει ὑπεραίρει τὰ
πλεῖστα. ταῦτα δὲ ἄμφω τὰ ἱερὰ πρὸ τοῦ τῆς
πόλεως πεποιήται τείχους, τὸ μὲν ἀρχομένου
παρὰ τὴν τῆς θαλάσσης ἡϊόνα, τὸ δὲ ἄγχιστά
πη τῶν Χρυσῶν καλουμένων Πυλῶν, ἃς δὴ
ἄμφι τὸ τοῦ ἐρύματος πέρασ συμβαίνει εἶναι,
ὅπως δὴ ἄμφω ἀκαταγώνιστα φυλακτῆρια τῷ
περιβόλῳ τῆς πόλεως εἶεν.

And he dedicated another church to Mary in the location called Pege. In this place, there is a thick grove of cypresses, a meadow blooming with flowers in its soft ground, a garden abounding with seasonal fruits, and a spring bubbling quietly with a gentle stream of sweet water, all especially suitable for a sacred place. Such are the surroundings of this precinct. But the church itself, it is not easy to describe in terms worthy of it, nor outline it in the mind or whisper it with words. It will suffice to only say that it surpasses most churches in both beauty and size. Both of these churches were built in front of the city-walls, one where the wall starts

by the seashore, the other close to what is called the Golden Gates, which happens to be near the end of the defensive line, so that both might act as unconquerable outposts to the circuit wall of the city.

It is apparent that Nicephorus's approach here was to use material from Procopius without adapting it.¹¹⁷ Nicephorus was especially interested in the miracles and history of the Pege shrine, and some years before had dedicated an entire account to it,¹¹⁸ mostly based on the anonymous *Miracula Deiparae ad fontem* of the mid-tenth century.¹¹⁹ After relating Justinian's healing of dysentery and the rebuilding of the shrine (drawn from the *Miracula*), Nicephorus continued with the following:

Παρίτω τοίνυν ὁ ἐκ Καισαρείας Προκόπιος, καὶ
τὰ κατὰ τὸ παρὸν τέμενος διαζωγραφεῖται τῷ
λόγῳ, παρὼν δηλαδὴ καὶ ὅψεσιν οἰκείαις τοῦτο
ἐξακριβούμενος, ὅτι δῆτα πρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως
ἀνωκοδόμητο.¹²⁰

Now I pass on to Procopius from Caesarea, who depicted the current sanctuary in his discourse

117 On Nicephorus's plagiarism in other instances, see A. D. Karpozilos, "The Authorial Statements in the Ecclesiastical History of Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos," in *Μυριόβιβλος: Essays on Byzantine Literature and Culture*, ed. T. Antonopoulou, S. Kotzabassi, and M. Loukaki, *ByzArch* 29 (Berlin, 2015), 187–94, at 189–92.

118 On this updated collection (which awaits a critical edition by A.-M. Talbot), see S. Efthymiadis, "Le monastère de la Source à Constantinople et ses deux recueils de miracles: Entre hagiographie et patriographie," *REB* 64/65 (2006): 283–309, at 299–303; and I. Kimmelfield, "The Shrine of the Theotokos at the Pege," in *Fountains and Water Culture in Byzantium*, ed. B. Shilling and P. Stephenson (Cambridge, 2016), 299–313, at 300–302.

119 *Miracula Deiparae ad Fontem* (*AASS*, Nov. 3:878–89; A. M. Talbot and S. F. Johnson, trans., *Miracle Tales from Byzantium*, *DOML* 12 [Cambridge, MA, 2012], 205–97).

120 Nicephorus Callistus, *Miracula Deiparae ad Fontem*, miracle 2 (A. Pamperis, ed., *Νικηφόρου Καλλίστου τοῦ Ξανθοπούλου περί συστάσεως τοῦ σεβασμίου οἴκου τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Ζωοδόχου Πηγῆς καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ ὑπερφυῶς τελεσθέντων θαυμάτων* [Leipzig, 1802], 15–16). Nicephorus utilizes Procopius (*Aed.* 1.1.27–28) in the prologue of this text. See S. Constantinou, "A Rewriter at Work: Nikephoros Xanthopoulos and the Pege Miracles," in *Metaphrasis: A Byzantine Concept of Rewriting and Its Hagiographical Products*, ed. S. Constantinou and C. Högel, *Medieval Mediterranean* 125 (Leiden, 2020), 324–42, at 334.

116 Nicephorus Callistus, *Ecclesiastical History* 15.25 (PG 147:72).

by painstakingly describing in a clear manner, after seeing it with his own eyes, exactly what the emperor had rebuilt.

Nicephorus regards the *Buildings* as an authoritative text, prestigious enough to quote by name. When reporting on the Nika riot in *Ecclesiastical History* (for which he mostly drew on the *Wars*), Nicephorus adds the following about the providential destruction of Hagia Sophia, alluding to the *Buildings*:

Διὸ τοῦ θεοῦ παραχωροῦντος ἐκείνοις διαπρά-
ξασθαι τὸ ἀσέβημα, ἅτε οἶμαι εἰδότος οἷον ἔσε-
σθαι ἔμελλεν, Ἰουστινιανὸς μετὰ τὴν νίκην τὸ
μὲν εἰς ἄμυναν ἐκείνοις, τὸ δὲ δι' ἐκείνους ἀθρόον
πεσόντας θεὸν ἰλεούμενος, ἐς οἷον νῦν ὁρᾶται
προήγαγεν ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐγείρας κρηπίδων.¹²¹

Whereby God allowing them to fulfill this impious act, knowing (I think) what was destined to become, Justinian—after the victory, on the one hand, as a requital to those who rebelled, and on the other hand, to propitiate God for those who fell in so high numbers—brought the church to the form which is now visible by erecting it from its foundations.

Compare with *Aed.* 1.1.21 = **Aed.* 1.1.21:

... ἐπεχώρει δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς διαπράξασθαι τὸ
ἀσέβημα, προειδὼς εἰς ὅσον τι κάλλος τοῦτο τὸ
ἱερὸν μεταστῆσθαι ἔμελλεν.

... and God permitted them to achieve this impiety, anticipating the great beauty that the church was destined to turn into.

Nicephorus returned to the topic of Hagia Sophia in a later passage,¹²² paraphrasing the related section from Evagrius's *Ecclesiastical History*, thereafter leaving sufficient space in the manuscript for an excerpt from the

ekphrasis in the *Buildings* (*Aed.* 1.1.21–78) that he ultimately failed to fill. In sum, Nicephorus made extensive use of the *Buildings*. Since he alludes exclusively to sections that are found in both the short and long recensions, one cannot confirm to which he turned in specific instances.

Most of the extant *Buildings*'s manuscripts were written in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, so it is worth looking at its reception in the late Palaiologan period. For example, an excerpt of the *Buildings* (*Aed.* 1.1.23–2.12) was copied in the circle of Nicephorus Gregoras, though he never connects to it.¹²³ His contemporary George Galesiotes cites Procopius extensively in a monody on the collapse of Hagia Sophia found in Vat. gr. 112, folios 11v–12r. This monody was prompted by the collapse of the eastern part of the main dome on 19 May 1346.¹²⁴ Extensive use of the

123 Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana (Laur.), Plut. 70.5, dated to 1334–42. The relevant folios, 194–196, were written by copyist d, maybe a disciple of Nicephorus Gregoras. See J.-B. Clérigues, “Nicéphore Grégoras, copiste et superviseur du Laurentianus 70,5,” *Revue d'histoire des textes*, n.s., 2 (2007): 21–47, at 39–40. C. Occhipinti, “Sulla fortuna di Procopio di Cesarea nel XV secolo: Il Giustiniano di Costantinopoli e i primi monumenti equestri di età umanistica,” *Rinascimento* 42 (2002): 351–80, at 356. D. Bianconi, “La biblioteca di Cora tra Massimo Planude e Niceforo Gregora: Una questione di mani,” *Segno e Testo* 3 (2005): 391–438, at 413. Although Nicephorus himself wrote about the equestrian statue of Justinian in *Historia* 7.12.2–5 (L. Schopen and I. Bekker, eds., *Nicephori Gregorae Byzantina Historia*, CSHB 25–27 [Bonn, 1829–55], 2:274–77), on the occasion of its repairs by Emperor Andronicus II in 1317, he does not refer to Procopius. On this event, see R. S. Nelson, “The Chora and the Great Church: Intervisuality in Fourteenth-Century Constantinople,” *BMGS* 23 (1999): 67–101, at 71.

124 The identification of the alluded disaster and the author was ascertained by S. I. Kourouses, *Μανουήλ Γαβαλάς, εἷτα Ματθαῖος μητροπολίτης Ἐφέσου (1271/2–1355/60): Τὰ βιογραφικά* (Athens, 1972), 113–15, and adopted by Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur*, 143, and I. Pérez Martín, “El Vaticanus gr. 112 y la evolución de la grafía de Jorge Galesiotes,” *Scriptorium* 49 (1995): 42–59, at 55. The attribution by the first editor of the monody was demonstrably incorrect: K. Kumaniecki, “Eine unbekannte Monodie auf den Einsturz der Hagia Sophia im Jahre 558,” *BZ* 30 (1929/30): 35–43. On George Galesiotes, who served as sacellarius of Hagia Sophia from 1330 to 1346, see *PLP*, no. 3528. For the scribe, see E. Gamillscheg, *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten, 800–1600* (Vienna, 1997), 55, no. 97; G. De Gregorio, “Un'aggiunta su copisti greci del secolo XIV: A proposito di Giovanni Duca Malace, collaboratore di Giorgio Galesiota nell'Athen. EBE 2,” *Néa Pólymē* 16 (2019): 161–276. H. Hunger and I. Ševčenko, *Des Nikephoros Blemmydes Βασιλικὸς Ἀνδριᾶς und dessen Metaphrase*

121 Nicephorus Callistus, *Ecclesiastical History* 17.10 (PG 147: 244–45).

122 Nicephorus Callistus, *Ecclesiastical History* 17.20 (PG 147:269); G. Gentz, *Die Kirchengeschichte des Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos und ihre Quellen*, TU 98 (Berlin, 1966), 167, n. 2.

Buildings is detected in several instances, first in a long list of Hagia Sophia's attributes:

Τὸ **κεκαλλιστευμένον** καὶ **ὑπερφυῆς θέαμα**, τὸ πάσης τῆς βασιλίδος **πόλεως** τῷ ὕψει θαυμαστώσ ὅπως πάντοθεν **ὑπερκείμενον** καὶ πᾶσαν ταύτην **κατακοσμοῦν** ὡς ἀπὸ σκοπιᾶς καὶ **περιωπῆς οὐρανόυ**.¹²⁵

[One might call it] the spectacle of great and extraordinary beauty, which wondrously towers over the entire imperial city as if rising above everything else, adorning the whole city as if it were a lookout and the summit of heavens.

Compare with *Aed.* 1.1.27:

Θέαμα τοίνυν ἡ ἐκκλησία **κεκαλλιστευμένον** γεγέννηται, τοῖς μὲν ὁρώσιν **ὑπερφυῆς**, τοῖς δὲ ἀκούουσι παντελῶς ἄπιστον· ἐπῆρται μὲν γὰρ ἐς **ὑψος οὐράνιον** ὅσον, καὶ ὥσπερ τῶν ἄλλων οἰκοδομημάτων ἀποσαλεύουσα ἐπινένευκεν **ὑπερκειμένη** τῇ ἄλλῃ **πόλει**, **κοσμοῦσα** μὲν αὐτήν, ὅτι αὐτῆς ἐστίν, ὡραϊζομένη δέ, ὅτι αὐτῆς οὔσα καὶ ἐπεμβαίνουσα τοσοῦτον ἀνέχει, ὥστε δὴ ἐνθένδε ἡ πόλις ἐκ **περιωπῆς ἀποσκοπεῖται**.

And the church has thus become a spectacle of great beauty, overwhelming to those who see it, and entirely beyond belief for those who hear about it. For it rises to a height that matches the sky, and as if anchored apart from the other buildings, it looks down, rising above the rest of the city, but adorning it as it is a part of it; it also takes pride in that, while it belongs to it [the city], by embarking upon it, it rises up to

von Georgios Galesiotes und Georgios Oinaiotes: Ein weiterer Beitrag zum Verständnis der byzantinischen Schrift-Koine, WByzSt 18 (Vienna, 1986), 33–34, have persuasively subdivided the *PLP* entry into two homonymous people, the author (relevant here) and the copyist, who was presumably a generation younger and a relative of the author. This being the case, it was the copyist who made the additions to the text of the author (noted in half brackets in S. I. Kourouses's edition, "Αἱ ἀντιλήψεις περὶ τῶν ἐσχάτων τοῦ κόσμου καὶ ἡ κατὰ τὸ ἔτος 1346 πτώσις τοῦ τροῦλλου τῆς Ἀγίας Σοφίας," *Επ.Ετ.Βυζ.Σπ.* 37 (1969/70): 247–50).

125 Kourouses, "Αἱ ἀντιλήψεις," 248, lines 41–44.

such a height that from there the whole city can be viewed as from a masthead.

... καὶ αὖ πάλιν ταῖς οἰκοθεν **μαρμαρυγαῖς** παρ' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ θαυμασιωτέραν ἀπαστράπτων¹²⁶ **τὴν αἶγλην τῇ τοῦ ἡλιακοῦ φωτός** ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκτίνων **περιουσία καταλαμπούση** καὶ πᾶσι μέρεσι διὰ τῶν φωταγωγῶν ὑέλων εἰσρεοῦση καὶ **περικεχυμένη** μετὰ κοσμιωτάτης σεμνότητος.¹²⁷

Time and again, from within the building glistening sunlight shines upon itself, and in it, the radiance flashes forward more wonderfully and shinier than the abundance of rays that also lit all parts when streaming through the glass windows, bathing it [the interior] with most decent dignity.

Compare with **Aed.* 1.1.29–30:

... φωτὶ δὲ καὶ ἡλίου **μαρμαρυγαῖς** ὑπερφυῶς πλήθει. φαίης ἂν οὐκ ἐξωθεν **καταλάμπεσθαι ἡλίῳ** τὸν χώρον, ἀλλὰ **τὴν αἶγλην** ἐν αὐτῷ φύεσθαι, τοσαύτη τις **φωτὸς περιουσία** ἐς τοῦτο δὴ τὸ ἱερὸν **περικέχεται**.

... and it is exceedingly filled with glistening sunlight. In fact, you might say that the space is not lit from outside by the sun, but that the radiance comes to life from inside it, such is the abundance of light that bathes this church.

The short recension has the compound verb διακέχεται (becomes diffused), thus the use of περικέχεται (is poured) indicates that Galesiotes used the long recension. In another passage he cites text that is only in the long recension:

... τοῦτον τὸν περιώνυμον ναὸν καὶ παμμέγιστον, ὃν δὴ βασιλεὺς ὁ κράτιστος καὶ ὑπερφυέστατης Ἰουστινιανὸς ἀφειδήσας **πάντων χρημάτων** τῇ μεγαλοφυῇ τῆς γνώμης πάσαις **σπουδαῖς** καὶ περινοίαις καὶ μηχαναῖς ἐκ πάσης

126 The word recalls *Aed.* 1.1.60.

127 Kourouses, "Αἱ ἀντιλήψεις," 248, lines 47–49.

ἡλικίας καὶ τύχης ἀνθρώπων καὶ τόπου καὶ
γένους παντὸς . . . ἀνεγείρει.¹²⁸

[One might call it] the famous and immense church, which the most-powerful and most-noble Emperor Justinian erected, disregarding all questions of expense, and by means of the great nature of his mind, all his zeal and ingenuity, and architects of all ages and fortunes of men and places and of all nations.

Compare with *Aed.* 1.1.23:

Ὁ μὲν οὖν βασιλεὺς ἀφροντιστήσας χρημάτων
ἀπάντων ἐς τὴν οἰκοδομὴν σπουδῇ ἔετο, καὶ τοὺς
τεχνίτας ἐκ πάσης γῆς ἤγειρεν ἅπαντας.

And the emperor at any rate, disregarding all questions of expense, zealously set himself toward its reconstruction, and he gathered all the craftsmen from the whole earth.

And with *Aed.* 1.1.23, as per the short recension:

Τοὺς τε γὰρ τεχνίτας ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐκ πάσης γῆς
ἤγειρεν ἅπαντας.

Again, Galesiotes augments Procopius's text and reshuffles and rewords parts of it. The last text sample concerns the earthquake that toppled the eastern arch and the eastern part of the main dome in 1346:

Τούτον εἶδον ἀπάσῃ τῇ αἰθερίῳ ἀψίδι, ἴσον δ'
εἰπεῖν οὐρανίῳ ἱρίδι, πεπτωκότα ἐκ τοῦ μέρους τοῦ
πρὸς ἀνίσχοντα ἥλιον καὶ ῥῆξιν ὑποστάντα.¹²⁹

I saw it falling at the entire upper arch; one could equate it with a gemstone in the heavens, bursting from the part toward the rising sun when it fell to the ground.

Compare with *Aed.* 1.1.40:

Τῶν δὲ ἀψίδων αἱ μὲν δύο κατὰ κενοῦ τοῦ ἀέρος
ἐπανεστήκασι πρὸς ἀνίσχοντά τε καὶ δύνοντά

που τὸν ἥλιον, αἱ δὲ λειπόμεναι οἰκοδομίαν τέ
τινα καὶ κίονας μικροὺς κομιδῇ ἐνεβθεν ἔχουσιν.

And while two of the arches rise over empty air, the one set toward the rising sun and the one toward the setting sun, the others have below them some sort of wall and some rather small columns.

Apart from Galesiotes evidentially citing the long recension, two additional observations are noteworthy. He augments the Procopian model: it was not mere skilled craftsmen from the entire earth, but architects, allegedly of all ages and nations, who built the church. By this modification, Galesiotes stresses the pan-Christian character of the undertaking. Regarding the collapse, Procopius's description of the construction of the arches would seem to have been the inspiration for Galesiotes' reverse description of them when one of them had come down.

Conclusion

The textual specimens analyzed here suggest that Procopius's *Buildings* had a narrow and almost indiscernible afterlife. The Byzantine reception of the *Buildings* really begins in the second half of the tenth century and is even patchy after that. Emperor Basil I's repairs and refurbishments of Justinianic churches may have sparked interest in their original shape and appearance when these repairs were recorded in the tenth century. During the so-called Macedonian Renaissance, the few references to the *Buildings* should be understood as part of a systematic reappropriation of the Justinianic past.¹³⁰ That period was also marked by the reappropriation of Justinianic literature and the revival of the genre of ekphrasis.¹³¹ Only in the Palaiologan

130 Magdalino, "Distance of the Past." See also A. Németh, *The Excerpta Constantiniana and the Byzantine Appropriation of the Past* (Cambridge, 2018), 171.

131 Kaldellis, "Late Antique Literature," 563. Ekphraseis from the Macedonian period did not turn to Eusebius's *Vita Constantini* for other reasons: F. Winkelmann, "Die Beurteilung des Eusebius von Cäsarea und seiner *Vita Constantini* im griechischen Osten: Ein Beitrag zur Untersuchung der griechischen hagiographischen Vitae Constantini," in *Byzantinistische Beiträge*, ed. J. Irmscher (Berlin, 1964), 91–119, at 110–11. Choricus of Gaza, however, was appreciated as a literary model due to his clarity and pure style: Photius,

128 Ibid., lines 57–60.

129 Ibid., lines 76–77.

period did the reception of the *Buildings* undergo a major shift, with the work for the first time being regarded as an authoritative text for the Justinianic era and with that its rhetorical style reflected upon in a meaningful way and considered excellent.

The accounts of the Byzantine authors presented above provide an idea of the way in which the *Buildings* was employed—primarily as a source of information, not a literary prototype. In regard to the information it imparts, one has to consider that half of the edifices described in book 1 remained, in one way or another, extant by the tenth century, when reception of the *Buildings* took off. Whereas the writers before that time described buildings based on firsthand assessments rather than resorting to Procopius (provided the text was even accessible), authors after that time utilized Procopius's text only infrequently, and this concerns book 1 solely, since the buildings in books 2 through 6 were, for the most part, beyond Byzantine control or had been destroyed by the tenth century. Moreover, as the paucity of references shows, the *Buildings* had virtually no impact on shaping later views of the Justinianic period.

Regarding the literary qualities of the *Buildings* with the potential to be echoed in later texts, one finds little to that effect during the entire Byzantine period. One must recall that the inherent theme and narrative system of the *Buildings* was aimed at praising the emperor as the creator of beautiful, spacious, and magnificent edifices, thereby showing God's favor for the empire. Although this theme continued to be cultivated, no resonance from the *Buildings* can be detected. Was the style of the *Buildings*'s regarded as mediocre compared to other texts, undeserving of imitation and useless to Byzantine literati?

While in the past, mimesis of ancient literature was considered to be the dominant driving force of Byzantine authors, today that is no longer regarded as a "constraint or inhibiting factor in the development of original literature but it is increasingly perceived by scholars as a highly adaptive cultural and intellectual

framework."¹³² Still, as Emmanuel Bourbouhakis has pointed out, Byzantine authors indeed evaluated the style of their own and earlier Byzantine literature—what learned Byzantine rhetors called the "character of an author"—yet today there are no efficient tools for fully comprehending their lines of thinking. For this reason, it remains a dubious endeavor to proffer reasons for the slight reception the *Buildings* received with regard to its ekphrastic and encomiastic qualities (of which only Nicephorus Xanthopoulos offers an evaluation). It is apparent that the *Buildings* was of little practical use to later Byzantine authors¹³³—"usefulness" generally meaning that it yielded interesting information, a rich vocabulary, and a number of noteworthy phrasings. The *Buildings* did not meet these prerequisites due to being strictly limited to a specific topic and lacking quotable maxims.

There is, however, another line of inquiry that can be followed. Literary genre certainly has an effect on the transmission and reception of texts, and thus likely also plays a role in any subsequent neglect. Procopius introduces the *Buildings* as a historical record in an effort to safeguard the work's posterity,¹³⁴ yet it is certainly a bizarre history. The *Buildings* basically failed to achieve emulation; no later Byzantine author ever sought to produce another *Buildings* (or *Anecdota*). The Byzantine manuscripts, however, evince sufficient affirmation of the *Buildings*'s assignment to history: The text is, when not found as part of a Procopian codex, adjoined to historiographical works and philosophical treatises, for example, Vat. gr. 1065 and Laur. Plut. 70.5.¹³⁵ It is never attached to texts remarkable for their oratory.

As for the relationship between the long and short recension, the salient issue involves which of them was accessible or even considered to be the authoritative text. It has been ascertained that Michael Psellus, Michael (ὁ τοῦ Θεσσαλονίκης), George Pachymeres,

Bibliotheca, cod. 160 (Henry, *Photius*, 2:121–23), and was much utilized by Leo the Wise. For the latter's Byzantine reception, see E. Amato, "The Fortune and Reception of Choricus and of His Works," in *Rhetorical Exercises from Late Antiquity: A Translation of Choricus of Gaza's Preliminary Talks and Declamations*, ed. R. J. Penella (Cambridge, 2009), 266–302.

132 E. C. Bourbouhakis, "Byzantine Literary Criticism and the Classical Heritage," in *The Cambridge Intellectual History of Byzantium*, ed. A. E. Kaldellis and N. Siniossoglou (Cambridge, 2017), 113–28, at 114.


133 This constituted a major aspect of Byzantine literary criticism. See Conley, "Byzantine Criticism," 670–71.

134 *Aed.* 1.1.2–4.

135 Montinaro, *Études sur l'évergétisme*, xiii–xvi; Flusin, "Remarques sur la tradition manuscrite du *De aedificiis*," 10–12.

and George Galesiotes made use of the long recension, but for other Byzantine authors both recensions potentially provided what they needed. The study here cannot settle this issue, but it highlights that both versions circulated simultaneously at least from the eleventh century. The main text witness of the long recension, Vat. gr. 1065, is already interspersed with readings from the short recension. The incentive for further investigation of the *Building* continues.

Johannes Gutenberg-
Universität Main
55099 Mainz

 THIS PAPER STEMS FROM “PROCOPIUS AND the Language of Buildings,” an ongoing project to produce a digital commentary on the *Buildings*. Led by Marietta Horster and Gunnar Brands, the project is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German Research Foundation) at the Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz and Martin-Luther-Universität Halle. The author is grateful to Panagiotis A. Agapitos for providing extremely useful feedback on an earlier draft. He would also like to thank Zachary Chitwood and the anonymous reviewers for their careful reading and perceptive suggestions leading to a greatly improved revision of this article.